William John Chesshyre

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
* JAN 8 1901 *
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Division
Section
No.

SCC
7584
v. 2

THE

WORKS

Of the Right Reverend

GEORGE BULL, D.D.

Late Biſhop of St. *DAVID*'s,

Concerning the HOLY TRINITY.

CONSISTING OF

I. The Defence of the *Nicene* Creed.

II. Judgment of the Catholick Church of the three firſt Centuries, concerning the Neceſſity of believing *that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is true God*, aſſerted againſt *M. Simon Epiſcopius*, and others.

III. The Primitive and Apoſtolical Tradition concerning the received Doctrine in the Catholick Church, of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt's Divinity, aſſerted, and plainly proved, againſt *Daniel Zuicker* a *Pruſſian*, and his late Diſciples in *England*.

Tranſlated into *ENGLISH*:

WITH

The *Notes* and *Obſervations* of Dr. *GRABE*. And ſome *Reflections* upon the late Controvertiſts in this Doctrine.

By FR. HOLLAND, *M. A.* Rector of *Sutton*, *Wilts*, and Chaplain to the Rt Hon. *Thomas* Lord Viſcount WEYMOUTH.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

Printed for STEPHEN AUSTEN at the *Angel* and *Bible*, in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*. 1730.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/worksofrightreve02bull

TO

The REVEREND

JOHN YOUNGER, D.D.

Dean of SARUM.

Honoured Sir,

THE Design of this Translation is to acquaint the People with the Antiquity and Universality of their most Holy Faith in the Son of God; to

ſhew them, that his true and proper Divinity is part of that Profeſſion firſt deliver'd to the Saints. The *Gnoſtics* (as great Pretenders to Knowledge as the *Arians* of this Age) gave it an early oppoſition. This has been unfortunately reviv'd in many ſucceeding Centuries, but never ſubſiſted except by Fraud or Force; and when at the higheſt, ow'd its growth not to Councils legally call'd, and freely held, not to the general Suffrage of antient Doctors, but to the Connivance or Encouragement of ſecular Powers. By theſe excellent Pieces, the groundleſs Aſſertions of ſome zealous Moderns are detected, who are often ſending us to *Montanus* or *Rome* for holding this Article, tho' (*a*) *Tertullian*

(*a*) Ed. Rigalt. adv. Praxeam, p. 635. Nos vero & ſemper, & nunc magis ut inſtructiores per Paracletum, deductorem ſcilicet omnis veritatis, &c. *St.* Jerome *charges the*

tullian declares he believ'd it, whilſt he was a Catholick; and the World neither felt nor fear'd the Errors and Tyranny of Papal Power, when it univerſally obtain'd in the Weſtern Church.

I hope the Deſign is executed with exactneſs enough to make it ſerviceable. As you have been remarkable in your Station for oppoſing the Revival of old Hereſy, and modern Fanaticiſm, I have taken the Liberty to inſcribe it to you. The intended Reſpect to your Character, begs your Excuſe rather than your

the Montaniſts *with* Sabellianiſm, *ſo far are they from being* Trinitarians. Ed. Froben. Tom. 2. p. 128. Ep. ad Marcellam. Primum in Fidei regula diſcrepamus, Nos Patrem, & Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum in ſua unumquemque perſona ponimus, licet ſubſtantia copulemus: Illi [Montaniſtæ] Sabellii dogma ſectantes, Trinitatem in unius perſonæ anguſtias cogunt. *According to* Tertullian, *if they are* Trinitarians, *that Faith is not peculiar to* Montaniſm; *according to* Jerome, *they are the contrary, even* Sabellians.

Ac-

Acceptance, and is wholly grounded upon a Sentiment universally receiv'd and put in practice; That Honour is always due to Merit and Station, and that it is the Duty of one to offer it, where there is no addition to another in receiving it.

Honoured Sir,

Your most Humble Servant,

FR. HOLLAND.

THE CONTENTS of the Second Volume.

A Defence of the Nicene Faith. Sect. 4. *Of the Subordination of the Son to the Father, as to his Original and Principle.* Pag. 1

CHAP. I.

The First Thesis is propos'd concerning this Subordination, and confirm'd by the unanimous Consent of the Antients, &c. ibid.

CHAP. II.

The Second Thesis is propos'd and confirm'd, in which is shewn, That the Antients with one Voice taught, &c. p. 16

CHAP. III.

A large Answer to the Objection, against what has been said in the former Chapter, &c. p. 37

CHAP. IV.

The third Thesis is proposed, in which the Use of the Doctrine of the Son's Subordination is explained. p. 66

The Conclusion of the whole Work. p. 88

THE Judgment of the Catholick Church of the three First Centuries, *&c. Preface.* Pag. 102

The Introduction. p. 106

CHAP. I.

The Testimonies of the Primitive Fathers, That the Article of our Lord's Divinity is absolutely necessary to be believ'd, in order to Salvation. p. 109

CHAP. II.

Of those who in the First Age of Christianity opposed the Doctrine of the Gospel, concerning Christ's being God and Man. p. 124

CHAP. III.

Of those who deny'd Jesus Christ to be true God, in the second and third Ages. p. 152

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Creeds of the Primitive Church: And first, of the first and most antient Creed, and the Explications of it in Irenæus *and* Tertullian. p. 160

CHAP. V.

Of the Creed, call'd the Apostles. p. 171

CHAP. VI.

Of the antient Eastern *Creed.* p. 200

Notes upon the 5th, 6th, and 7th Chapters. p. 229

CHAP. VII.

Of a famous Place in Justin's *Dialogue with* Trypho *the* Jew. p. 248

Appendix to the Seventh Chapter. p. 268

THE Primitive and Apostolical Tradition concerning the receiv'd Doctrine in the Catholick Church, *&c. The Introduction.* p. 284

CHAP. I.

That Justin *was not the first who introduced the Doctrine of our Saviour's Pre-existence before the World was made, &c.* p. 287

CHAP. II.

That Justin *was not deceiv'd by the Frauds of the* Simonians, *&c.* p. 303

CHAP. III.

Concerning Hegesippus, *and his Opinion of the Person of Jesus Christ.* p. 309

CHAP. IV.

Of the Orphic Verses, *and, by way of Digression, of the* Sybilline Oracles, *&c.* p. 325

CHAP. V.

That Justin *did not learn from the* Platonics *the Notions he has given us of the Word.* p. 339

CHAP. VI.

That Justin *entirely abhorr'd Paganism, and the Worship of more Gods, &c.* p. 348

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

NICENE FAITH.

VOL. II.

SECT. IV.

Of the Subordination of the Son to the Father, as his Original and Principle.

CHAP. I.

The First Thesis is propos'd concerning this Subordination, and confirm'd by the unanimous Consent of the Antients. It is shewn, that the manner of speaking of some Moderns, in which they call the Son God of, *or* from Himself, *is contrary to the* Nicene *Synod, and the Opinion of all Catholick Doctors before and after it.*

WE have said a great deal concerning the Subordination of the Son to the Father, by the way, in the preceding Sections; but the Argument is very well worthy a more accurate Explication by itself, especially since in the beginning of our Work, we proposed

posed to confirm it by Testimonies, as a distinct Head of Doctrine, deliver'd in the *Nicene Creed.* Let this be the Thesis concerning this Subordination.

THESIS I.

The Catholick Doctors who have wrote before and since the Nicene *Council, have, by their Suffrage, confirm'd that Decree of the Council, in which it is determin'd, that the Son is God of God. For they have with one Mouth taught, that the Divine Nature and Perfections agree to the Father and the Son, not collaterally, or co-ordinately, but subordinately,* i. e. *That the Son hath indeed the same Divine Nature common with the Father, but communicated by the Father; so that the Father alone hath that Divine Nature of himself, or from no other; but the Son from the Father, and therefore, that the Father is the Fountain, Original, and Principle of the Divinity which is in the Son.*

2. We need not give our selves much Trouble in proving that Part of our Thesis which relates to the *Ante-Nicene* Doctors, because it is sufficiently confirm'd by most of the Testimonies cited concerning the Generation of the Son in the second and third Sections. *The very Words Son and Generation do* at first imply the † Subordination of the Son to the Father, who begat him; and these Words they use every where. *Novatian,* or the Author of the Book concerning the Trinity among *Tertullian's* Works, hath indeed express'd the common Notion of these Antients, in a *Place cited* by us before more than once. Whatsoever, *says he,* the Son is, he is not of himself, because not unborn; but of the Father, because begotten. Whether he is the Word, or the Power,

† *Dr.* Whitby *would make his Reader believe that Bishop* Bull *has own'd a Subordination in Essence; for to the Bishop's Words he has very honestly added these* [quoad essentiam] *and printed the whole Sentence in a different Character. But this is not the only Passage, in which he has been forc'd upon very unfair Methods in order to prove an Absurdity upon the great Prelate.* Vid. Modestæ Disquisitiones præf. *p.* 23.

or

or the Wisdom, or the Light, or the Son, and whatsoever of these he is, he is that from no other Cause than the Father, owing his Original to his Father. *Justin Martyr* expressly says, (*a*) that the Father is to the Son the Cause of his Being. Hence it is usual with the same *Justin*, and the other Ante-*Nicene* Writers, to call God the Father, by way of Distinction; sometimes God absolutely, sometimes the one God, sometimes the God and Father of all, (according to the (*b*) Scriptures) namely, because the Father alone is God of himself, but the Son God of God. For this Cause also those Writers, as often as they name the Father and the Son together, commonly give the Name of God to the Father, denoting the second Person by the Title of Son of God, or Saviour, or Lord, or some such like Appellation. *Tertullian* speaks well upon this Point: I will follow the Apostle, *says he*, so that if the Father and Son are to be named together, I'll call the Father God, and Jesus Christ our Lord. Now I can only call Christ God, as the same Apostle does; of whom Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever. For I will call a Ray of the Sun by itself, the Sun; but when I name the Sun, whose Ray it is, I'll not at the same time call the Ray also the Sun.

3. But, as I said, No-body can doubt whether the *Ante-Nicene* Doctors acknowledg'd the Subordination, of which we speak. It remains then to shew, that the *Post-Nicene* Fathers deliver'd the same Doctrine, and were constant Defenders of the Faith determin'd in it, that no one may think we have mistaken the Words of the *Nicene Creed*. They also bravely affirm, that the Father is the Cause, Principle, and Author of the Son, and even call the Father the One God. First, then, they call the Father the Principle of the Son, namely, as that Word Principle signifies that,

(*a*) Justin, *p.* 358. (*b*) 1 Cor. viii. 4. Eph. iv. 6. John xvii. 3.

from which ſomething ariſes, no matter how; that is, whether in Time, or from Eternity; not as it ſignifies a Beginning of Exiſtence, when a thing, which before was not, begins to be. *Athanaſius* thus (*a*) explains thoſe Words of *John: In the Beginning was the Word*, as though the Evangeliſt had written, the Son was in the Father: for according to *John*, the Word was in this Principle, *and the Word was with God.* For God is the Principle, and ſince the Word was from it, the *Word was God.* Now *Gregory Nyſſen* (*b*) accurately explains the (*c*) Notion of the Word *Principle*, how the Son hath the Father as his Principle; and alſo, how he is without Principle: *But ſince the Word* Ἀρχή, or Principle, hath many Significations, and an extenſive Idea, we ſay there are ſome of them, in which we are not to deny to the only begotten Son the Title of *Beginningleſs.* For when by the Word Beginningleſs, we have the Notion of having a Subſiſtence from no Cauſe, we confeſs it to be proper to the Father only: but when the Queſtion is of any of the other Significations of the Word Beginning, as when it hath the Idea of the beginning of any Creature, of Time and Order, in theſe we bear Teſtimony to the only Begotten, that he is above, or *higher than* Beginning; ſo that we believe him, by whom all things were made, to be above every Beginning of Creation, Notion of Time, and Degree of Order: So that the Word is not Beginningleſs in Subſiſtence, but in every other reſpect, is confeſſedly Beginningleſs; that the Father is Beginningleſs, and Unbegotren, but that the Son is after the manner aforeſaid Beginningleſs, but not Unbegotten. Thus alſo (*d*) *Gregory Nazianzen* explains how the Three Divine Perſons are equally

(*a*) Vol. 1. Tom. 1. p. 617.

(*b*) Ed. Grets. p. 118. Lib. 1. contra Eunomium.

(*c*) *This Notion of St.* Gregory Nyſſen *is abundantly confirm'd by many Places of the Antients, both before and after the* Nicene *Council, as is plain from ſeveral Notes I have made before.*

(*d*) Orat. 35. p. 562.

Beginning-

Beginningleſs, and how the Father alone is Beginningleſs. How are they, the Son and Spirit, not Beginningleſs with him, the Father, if eternal with him? They are from him, but not after him. What is Beginningleſs, is Eternal; but what is Eternal, is not altogether Beginningleſs, ſo long as it is referr'd to the Father, as the Beginning, they are not then Beginningleſs with reſpect to the Cauſe. And *again*, (*a*) the Father is properly ſaid of him that is Beginningleſs, the Son of him that is begotten Beginningleſs. Laſtly, *Cyrillus Alexandrinus*, in the beginning of his firſt Book of Commentaries upon *John*, teaches, that the Father is the Principle of the Son or Beginning, only as he is that from which he proceeded.

4. The Word Cauſe ἄιτιος, or αἰτία, in *Latin Cauſa*, is of the ſame nature with Principle, or *Principium*. I have a little before obſerv'd, that *Juſtin Martyr* hath ſaid that the Father is the Cauſe of the Son. Now, the Catholick Authors who wrote after the Riſe of the *Arian* Controverſy, ſpeak after the like manner: They ſay that one Perſon in the Trinity, namely, God the Father, is the Cauſe, and that there are which are cauſed, the Son and Holy Spirit. (*b*) So *Conſtantine* the Great; The Father is the Cauſe of the Son, and the Son is cauſed. (*c*) So *Athanaſius* (or ſome other Perſon, Catholick without doubt in this Doctrine) The Son is not the Cauſe, but the Cauſed. (*d*) *Baſil* ſays, We ſay the Father is ſet before the Son, as Cauſes are before thoſe things that proceed from them. *And again*, (*e*) The Father, what elſe doth it ſignify, but to be the Cauſe and Beginning of him, who is begotten of him? In like manner, *Gregory Nazianzen* (*f*) aſſerts more than once, that the Father is the Cauſe of the Son and Holy Spirit: For he would be the Principle of ſmall things, and

(*a*) Pag. 590. (*b*) Euſeb. E. H. p. 480. (*c*) Tom. 2. p. 339. (*d*) Baſil, Tom. 1. p. 720. (*e*) p. 724. (*f*) Greg. Naz. Orat. 29. Tom. 1. p. 490.

things unworthy of him, if he was not the Cauſe of the Godhead in the Son and Holy Spirit. And *a little after*, in the ſame place: There is one God, the Son and Holy Spirit being referr'd to one Cauſe. *And again* he ſaith, that God the Father is the Principle, as the Cauſe, Fountain, and eternal Light †. *Damaſcene* (*a*) alſo writes thus: We acknowledge a Difference of Subſiſtence in theſe Three Properties only, in the Father's and uncaus'd; the Son's and caus'd; the Proceſſive and caus'd. The ſame Perſon, in his firſt Book of Images, not far from the beginning: The Son is the Image of the inviſible God, who hath the Father in him, and is in all things the ſame with him, except in this one, that he is from him, as from a Cauſe. For the Father is the natural Cauſe from which the Son proceeds. Of the *Latins*, (*b*) *Marius Victorinus* has ſpoke after the ſame manner: But the Father is greater, in that he gave all things to the Son, and is to the Son the Cauſe of his Being, and of his being after ſuch a manner. Now before, *Victorinus* had ſaid, that the Son indeed was the principal Cauſe of all things, but the Father the ſuperior Cauſe, as being the Cauſe of the Son. *Hilary* (*c*) calls the Father the Cauſe of the Nativity of the Son. And (*d*) *ſpeaking* of the eternal Generation of the Son, he ſaith, And being born of a Cauſe, yet perfect and immutable, it is neceſſary he be born of that Cauſe in the Propriety of that Cauſe. Laſtly, *Auguſtine* (*e*) alſo ſpeaks after the ſame manner: God is the Cauſe of all things that are. As he is the Cauſe of all things, he is the Cauſe of his own Wiſdom, nor was God ever without his Wiſdom. Therefore he is the eternal Cauſe of his own eternal Wiſdom, nor is he prior in Time to his own Wiſdom.

† *Compare with theſe* Orat. 24. p. 429. *and* Orat. 27. p. 501.
(*a*) Damaſc. Lib. 3. de Orthod. fide, c. 5. (*b*) In Lib. 1. adv. Arium. (*c*) Hil. de Trin. Lib. 11. (*d*) Lib. 12. (*e*) Auguſt. Lib. 73. Quæſt. 16.

5. The

5. The Word Author is of the ſame Signification, which the *Latin* Doctors frequently attribute to the Father, in reſpect of the Son. Thus (*a*) *Hilary* upon that place of *John*, chap. 5. ver. 19. If he doeth what he doth, by Authority of the paternal Nature in him, the Father doeth it, who even now worketh on the Sabbath. The Son is not to be accus'd of working, inaſmuch as he hath before him the Authority of the Father's working. For the Words [the Son can't, *&c.*] muſt not be referr'd to Infirmity, but Authority. *Again*, (*b*) Now ſince the unbegotten God was the Author of the perfect Nativity of the Divine Bleſſedneſs, to be the Author of the Nativity is a ſacred Property of the Father. But he is not diſgrac'd, who by a genuine Nativity makes up a compleat Image of his Author. Nay, the ſame *Hilary* does in other Places very frequently uſe this Word; as in the 4*th* Book, explaining the 44*th* Pſalm, he ſaith: Wherefore God hath anointed thee, even thy God. *Thy*, with relation to the Author; *Thee*, to him who is of the Author: For he is God of God. *Again*, he is ſo the Image, not as to differ in kind, but to ſignify his Author. So in the Book of Synods, and in the Place which we have cited elſewhere: He is ſubject to the Father, as his Author. (*c*) *Auguſtine* alſo ſpeaks nicely, according to Cuſtom: In the Father, is inſinuated to us Authority; in the Son, Nativity; and in the Holy Spirit, the Community of the Father and Son; in the Three, Equality. Of the ſame Import are the Words Root, Fountain, Head, which the antient Catholicks do in like manner attribute to God the Father, with reſpect to the Son and Holy Spirit. So *Baſil*: (*d*) For the Father is he who hath a perfect Exiſtence, wanting nothing, the Root and Fountain of the Son and Holy Spirit. Thus alſo *Ambroſe*; (*e*) The Father is Lord, becauſe the Root of the Son. And again: (*f*) The

(*a*) Lib. 9. de Trin. (*b*) Ibid. (*c*) Serm. 11. de Verb. Domini ſecund. Matth. (*d*) Homil. 27. contra Sabell. Tom. 1. p. 606. (*e*) Lib. 10. *in* Lucam. (*f*) *In* Lib. 4. de ſulm. c. 5.

Father is the Fountain of the Son, the Father is the Root of the Son. And *Ruffinus*, upon the Creed, calls the Father the Head of the Son. And though he is the Head of all things, the Father is the Head of him.

6. Laſtly, The Antients were not afraid to call God the Father, as being the Principle, Cauſe, Author, and Fountain of the Son, the one and only God. Thus the very *Nicene* Fathers begun their Creed, We believe in one God the Father Almighty, *&c.* And then ſubjoin, And in one Jeſus Chriſt——God of God. The (*a*) *Great Athanaſius*, who knew the Senſe of the *Nicene* Council as well as any one, yields that the Father is juſtly call'd the one God, becauſe only unbegotten, and only the Fountain of the Godhead. Omitting others, which I might cite, I ſhall only add to him the Authority of *Hilary*. He explains the Paſſage of *John* the Evangeliſt, chap. 17. ver. 3. in his 3*d* Book upon the Trinity, and writes thus: The Son gives the Father due Honour, when he ſays, *Thee the only true God.* But yet the Son doth not ſeparate himſelf from the Truth or Reality of God, or the Godhead, when he adds, *And Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* There is no Difference in the Confeſſion of Believers, becauſe in both of them is the Hope of Life. Neither is the true God gone off from him, who has him jointly [with the Son] When therefore it is ſaid, That they may know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent; under this Signification of him that ſendeth, and him that is ſent, the Truth and Divinity of the Father and Son is no way diſtinguiſh'd; but the Faith of our Religion is ſet to the Confeſſion of one that begat, and another that is begotten. To all theſe Teſtimonies, I will add this by way of Concluſion, That this Doctrine of one Principle in the Trinity without Principle, namely, the Father, was ſo fix'd and eſtabliſh'd in the primi-

(*a*) Tom. 2. p. 37.

tive

tive Church, that in the *49th* of thoſe Canons, call'd Apoſtolical, he is condemned, who ſhall baptize into Three [Perſons] Beginningleſs, or without Principle. Upon which Canon, this is † *Zonaras's* Note: For the Church is taught to worſhip one Beginningleſs, the Father, as having no Cauſe; and one Son, as being ineffably begotten; and one Comforter, the Holy Ghoſt.

7. This Theſis is eſpecially worth Notice, upon account of ſome * Moderns, who obſtinately contend, that the Son may properly be call'd God of himſelf. This Opinion now is both repugnant to their Hypotheſes who defend it, and to Catholick Conſent. *For they ſay*, that the Son of God is from God the Father, as he is Son, not as he is God; that he had his Perſon, not his Eſſence or Divine Nature, from the Father. But this is contradictory: For as *Petavius* (*b*) rightly obſerves, the Son cannot be begotten of the Father, unleſs he have from him his Nature and Godhead. For what elſe is it to be begotten, than to be born of another after a Similitude of Nature? Thus it is neceſſary that he who is begotten, ſhould have a Nature communicated from him that begat, that he may be like him. But if Chriſt, as he is the Son of God, is not God, or without Divinity, he only had a Relation from the Father: But a Relation can't be without a Subject. A Perſon here can't be without a Subſtance, unleſs

† *See how the Anſwer to the Queries tranſlates, and mutilates* Zonaras, p. 83.

* *Dr.* Clarke *endeavours to ſhew, that this Notion is contrary to another of the Biſhop's*, (Sect. 2. Chap. 9.) *where he diſtinguiſhes our Lord into God abſolutely, or relatively as God of God*, &c. *and urges, that he muſt either believe as they do, whom he oppoſes, or contradict himſelf: But where is the Contradiction to ſay this? The Man that deriv'd his Being from another is abſolute Man, and alſo Man in the Relation of a Son to him from whom he deriv'd it. Can't this Diſtinction be made, and different Regards be had to this Man in each of theſe reſpects, without affirming him to be in one of them a Man, and in the other a Perſon only. Is he not as well a Perſon, as he is an abſolute Man, as he is one when relatively conſider'd?*

(*b*) De Trin. Lib. 3. c. 3. n. 3.

you

you make a Perſon in the Divinity to be only a mere Mode of Exiſtence, which is *Sabellianiſm.*

Hence the ſame *Petavius* hath in another place juſtly pronounc'd them to be in a very great Error, (*a*) not verbal, as *Bellarmine* thought, but real, who would have the Son to be God of himſelf. He ſubjoins his Reaſons, that it overthrows, what he ſeems plainly to profeſs, namely, that the Son is generated of the Father. For, *ſays he*, Generation cannot be conceiv'd without the Communication of ſomething; nay, further, of no other thing, but Nature, Eſſence, Subſtance, for as much as the Production is ſubſtantial; and Generation in this differs from other Propagations of Quality or Quantity. But if Eſſence is communicated to the Son by Generation, he hath Eſſence from the Father, not from himſelf. Otherwiſe he would either not be begotten, or not be begotten of another. Hence *Damaſcenus* (*b*) very well ſays, All things which the Son and Spirit have, they have of the Father, even Exiſtence itſelf.

8. How this Opinion is repugnant to Catholick Conſent, I have ſhewn a little before. The very Synod of *Nice* hath decreed, that the Son is God of God: but he who is God of God, can't be ſaid to be God from himſelf, without a manifeſt Contradiction. But why do I endeavour to tye them up by the Authority of the *Nicene* Council, who have no Regard to it? For the Ring-leader of this Sect is not afraid to call the venerable Fathers of it *Fanaticks*; the Form of Confeſſion, namely, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, harſh, tautologous, and fitter for a Sonnet than a Creed. * I dread to repeat what he has

(*a*) De Trin. Lib. 6. c. 11. n. 10. (*b*) De Fide Orthod. Lib. 1. c. 10.

* Dr. Clarke, *&c. take great Notice of this Paſſage; a disjointed, ſingle Sentence; as they alſo do of moſt of the other Places, which expreſs or imply the Subordination, either in the Holy Fathers, or our learned and pious Biſhop. It is enough with them to ſay, that the Weight of Truth oblig'd them to make ſuch Conceſſions. This Weapon will*

has ſaid, and ſeriouſly exhort the pious and ſtudious Youth to beware of that Spirit, from which ſuch things proceeded. We have indeed great Obligations to that Perſon for his good Service in the Popiſh Controverſy; but far be it from us to take him for our Maſter, to ſwear what he thinks fit to ſay; or, laſtly, to be afraid, upon all juſt Occaſions, freely to cenſure his manifeſt Errors, his novel, uncatholick Tenets. Whoſoever he is, or in other reſpects how great ſoever, who deſpiſes the Authority of the antient Catholick Church, ſo far we ſhall give him no Credit or Authority. The Sonnet, ſo much derided by the Great Man, was ſung by a ſacred Choir of about three Hundred Biſhops, and Presbyters and Deacons innumerable, aſſembled in that Firſt and moſt Auguſt Oecumenical Synod. The *Ante-Nicene* Catholick Doctors ſung the ſame with wonderful Harmony, as we have prov'd by Citations from them in the ſecond and third Sections. In a word, That the Son of God is God of God, is the Voice and Song of the whole Catholick Church of Chriſt, conſonant to the Word of God in his holy Oracles, and never [in primitive Times] oppoſed by any, but at his own Peril.

9. I will add one thing further from *Petavius*, (*a*) That that Opinion is manifeſtly contrary to the Doctrine of the firſt Reformers, *Luther* and *Melanchon*. For *Luther*, (*b*) among many other things erroneouſly determin'd by that corrupt Church, reckons that Decree of the *Lateran* Council, that the divine Eſſence neither generates, nor is generated. Who

will ſerve any Perſon that will make uſe of it. Suppoſe the Doctor and his Friends had, as they boaſt, all the Antients on their ſide, and ſome Orthodox Adverſary ſhould glean a few Paſſages, which they rather chuſe to reject with Indignation, than explain conſiſtently with their Scheme, tacking to them the famous Gloſs (ſee how far the Weight of Truth will oblige, &c.) how eaſily might he be anſwer'd?

(*a*) De Trin. Lib. 6. c. 12. n. 1. (*b*) Tom. 2. fol. 70. Lib. de Captiv. Babylon.

then

then can doubt but that he thought their Opinion a manifeſt Error, who plainly deny that God is born of God, and teach that the Son is God, not from the Father, but himſelf? *Melanchon*, in his Explication of the *Nicene Creed*, thinks it truly ſaid, that the Eſſence of the Son is begotten, as it is ſaid in the Creed, God of God, Light of Light. Then he thus anſwers to this Objection: The ſame cannot beget itſelf; therefore ſince Eſſence is the ſame, Eſſence can't beget Eſſence: The ſame as incommunicable, can't beget itſelf; but the ſame as communicable, is communicated to the begotten: but Eſſence is communicable, therefore is communicated to the Begotten. At the ſame time and place, *Petavius* very ridiculouſly hugs himſelf in the Diſagreement of Hereticks, as he calls them, among themſelves. As though, forſooth, there was no Claſhing in the Church of *Rome*; when in this very Point, there is a manifeſt Contradiction between *Richardus Victorinus*, and the Maſter of the Sentences; (to ſay nothing of the Abbot *Joachim*) the one ſaying with *Auſtin*, and the other Fathers, that Subſtance begets Subſtance, and Wiſdom Wiſdom; the other aſſerting, that Eſſence doth not beget Eſſence. For *Petavius*, in vain, attempts to reconcile theſe jarring Notions: He confeſſes, that moſt of the Schoolmen and Divines thought, that the *Lateran* Council had determin'd before for the Opinion of the Maſter againſt the Doctrine of *Richard*. The Jeſuit muſt pardon us, if we give Credit to the Generality of Schoolmen and Divines, rather than *Petavius* only. I will add, that by the ſame Subtilties by which *Petavius* endeavours to ſet a Gloſs upon the Opinion of the Council and the Maſter, he may alſo excuſe that Error of *Calvin*'s, which ſo highly provokes him. The Caſe will be plain to any one, who conſiders it cloſely. But I wiſh that the Schoolmen on both ſides of the Queſtion, would forbear their trifling Subtilties upon this moſt venerable Myſtery; and that we might all embrace, with an holy Simplicity of Faith,

the

the Opinion of the Catholick Church, namely, that the Son of God is God of God, and very God of very God.

10. What a great Man objects, (*a*) That the Son is by *Origen* call'd Wisdom itself, Truth and Righteousness itself, is nothing at all to the purpose. For it is certain, that in those Words, the Pronoun which we render [itself] imports only the Reality of the Thing, not the Cause, or Original; so that *Origen* intended no more than that the Son, even as the Father, is the most perfect Wisdom, Truth and Righteousness, not in the mean time denying that the Son had all these Perfections from another, namely, from the Father. For so the same *Origen* (*b*) calls the Son in another Place, not only Wisdom itself, or the very Wisdom, but also the very Son. Where it is plain He is call'd the very Son, not as being the Son of himself, (for what cou'd be more absurd?) but as being the true and genuine Son of God. In this Sense also *Athanasius* applies the same Words to the Son of God, as we have cited him before. And in this Sense, no Catholick will deny that the Son of God is Αὐτοθεὸς, *i. e.* true and very God. Hence *Eusebius* (*c*) himself, who acknowledg'd the Subordination of the Son to the Father, as his Original and Principle, as much as any one, never doubted to say, that our Saviour was truly to be worship'd as the genuine Son of the Supreme God, and as very God. Here the Word Αὐτοθεὸς, it is manifest, does not denote God of, or from himself, but the very God; both because the Son of God is here call'd Αὐτοθεὸς, and that in the same Breath the Father is call'd the Supreme God, and also that the Word Αὐτοθεὸς is explanatory of what went before, namely the genuine Son: and lastly, from what follows in the same Place; for a little after, *Eusebius* speaking of the Government, and supreme Empire of

(*a*) Chamier. Corp. Theolog. l. 3. c. 19. p. 106. (*b*) Comment. in Joannem, Tom. 32. Ed. Huet. p. 416. (*c*) E. H. 307.

our

our Saviour, says, What could resist the Will of the Word, King of all, Governour of all, and very God? Now the Son is by *Eusebius* call'd Αὐτοθεὸς, as being very God, truly God, or God himself. But perhaps it may be worth the while to recite what the excellent *Valesius* hath noted upon the Place (*d*). This Place, says he, is especially to be observ'd, in which *Eusebius* calls Christ truly and of himself God; for this Place, in my Judgment indeed, is sufficient to refute all the Calumnies of those, who have believ'd *Eusebius* to be infected with Arianism. The very learned Father then is abundantly clear'd of this Accusation by the more plain Testimonies we have cited before. But I return to *Origen. He expresly affirms* (*e*), That the Father alone is God of himself, and ought to be call'd in *that Place*, where he thus opposes those Persons, who, that they might not seem to deny one God, either determin'd, that the Father and the Son were the same Person, or that the Son was essentially different from the Father: *They must say that God*, with the Article, is the Αὐτοθεὸς or very God of himself; because our Saviour says, in the Prayer to the Father, That they may know thee *the only true God*. But every thing besides the Αὐτοθεὸς or God of himself, is, by participation of the Divinity, made God. † In the mean time, in that very Place, *Origen* condemns those as denying the Divinity of the Son, who place his *Property*, and circumscribe his Essence, as different from the Father. He then confess'd that the Father and Son are of the same Substance, therefore that the Son is true God as

(*d*) Vales. Not. p. 172. (*e*) Comment. in Joannem, Tom. 2. p. 47. Ed. Huet.

† *The Answer to the Queries* (p. 41.) *cites two Passages out of* Origen's *Comment upon St.* John (*the Place from which these are cited*) *but takes no notice of this plain Declaration, which he might also have seen, if he had pleas'd. If he borrow'd these Fragments of Dr.* Clarke *indeed, he is not so much to be blam'd; for* p. 4, and 5. *of the Script. Doctrine, both* Origen *and* Athanasius *are represented in the same maim'd condition.*

well

well as the Father; he confeſs'd this, I ſay, in the ſame Breath, in which he pronounc'd that the Father alone could be call'd Αὐτοθεὸς, or God of himſelf; ſo that *Petavius* doth in vain carp at *Origen* in this Place. Conſult *Huetius* upon the Place if you pleaſe.

Grabe's *Annotations upon Section* 10.

To the Places cited from *Origen*, *Athanaſius*, and *Euſebius*, for the Phraſe in which the Son of God is call'd Αὐτοθεὸς, may be added the Authority of *Epiphanius* (*a*): God the Word having in himſelf all Perfection, being Perfection itſelf, very God, Power, Mind, and Light itſelf. In what Senſe theſe Words of his are to be taken by us, (*b*) *Athanaſius* hath excellently told us, He is not theſe by Participation, or as though he had theſe things externally, as thoſe who are partakers of him, or made wiſe by him, or are powerful or rational in him, but He is the very proper Wiſdom, Word, and Power of the Father. The Word Αὐτὸ prefix'd to Names, for the moſt part ſignifies, that the thing denoted by theſe Names is properly, eſſentially, and in its own nature ſuch [as it is ſaid to be:] Thus *Suidas* teaches. The Philoſophers, uſed the Word Αὐτὸ for properly ſpeaking, and they noted the Idea by this Word, ſaying Αὐτοάνθρωπος, (a very Man, or the Idea of Man) and Αὐτοδόξασὸν, that which is properly, or rather to be thought. After this manner, no Catholick can deny, as one excellent Author has well obſerv'd, that Chriſt is Αὐτόθεον, or very, proper God. Nor does he leſs truly deny that he is to be call'd Αὐτόθεον, as the prefix'd αὐτὸ denotes that this or that is ſo, or ſo of itſelf, but hath not a Subſtance or Quality deriv'd from another. For it is certain that Chriſt had his Godhead and Divine Attributes from the Father.

(*a*) Epiphan. Hæreſ. 77. (*b*) Vol. 1. Tom. p. 46.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Second Thesis is propos'd and confirm'd, in which is shewn, That the Antients with one Voice taught, that God the Father, as being the Original and Principle of the Son, was greater than He, and also, that the Son is in Nature equal to the Father.

I Suppose I have, in the former Chapter, sufficiently demonstrated that the Antients commonly acknowledg'd the Subordination of the Son to the Father, as his Original and Principle. Now that I am about to shew what they determin'd in consequence of it, I propose to illustrate and confirm this Thesis.

THESIS II.

The Catholick Doctors both before and after the Synod of Nice, *have unanimously determin'd, that God the Father is greater than the Son, even with respect to his Divinity, namely, not in Nature, or any essential Perfection which is in the Father and not in the Son; but in Authority,* i. e. *Original alone, as the Son is from the Father, not the Father from the Son.*

In this Thesis we assert two Things, 1*st*, That the Antients determin'd, That God the Father was greater than the Son, even with respect to his Divinity: 2*dly*, That they nevertheless taught that the Father was greater than the Son in Original only, but that both were in Nature equal. We will shew that the Antients deliver'd both these Doctrines with one Voice; and first we will begin with those who wrote before the Rise of Arianism.

2. Of whom *Justin*, almost the antientest of them all, manifestly makes a certain Order, or as it were Degree

Degree of Dignity in the Holy Trinity. In the Apology in the Vulgar Editions, call'd the Second, *he says*, (*a*) That the Christians did rationally reverence Christ, giving him the second Place. And *immediately* after he again says, That the Christians did justly give to Jesus Christ the second Place after the unchangeable, eternal God the Father of all Things (*b*). *Again*, in the same Apology; The first Power after God, the Father and Lord of all things, is the Son, who is the Word. And it is *parallel to this*, *that* in the same Apology, he again calls the Son (*c*) the Power next after the supreme God. *Lastly*, *In the Dialogue* with *Trypho*, (*d*) he calls the Son the Ministerial God of God, the Maker of all things. Yet the same *Justin* elsewhere, namely, in his Epistle to *Diognetus*, expressly denies that the Son of God is a Minister, calling him the Maker and Creator of all things. See the remarkable Passage cited entire *before* (*e*). You'll say, how can these things be reconcil'd? Easily. When the Son is call'd the second, or next after the Father, or the Minister of the Father, these Words denote a Subordination of Persons, as being originated one of another, but not a Difference or Inequality of Nature in the Divine Persons. The Father, as Father, is first in the Holy Trinity, the Son is next to the Father. In all the Divine Operations, the Son is the Minister of the Father, as he operates from God the Father, the Fountain and Original both of the Divine Essence and Operations; and the Father by him; not the Father from him, or he by the Father. Upon which account, *Clement* of *Alexandria*, (*f*) a true Catholick in this Article, doubted not to write thus concerning the Son of God: All the Power of the Lord is referr'd to the Almighty; and if we may so speak, the Son is the Energy of the Father. In the mean time, in most of those places in which he calls the Son the Minister of the Father, he has respect to that

(*a*) Pag. 60. (*b*) p. 74. (*c*) p. 93. (*d*) p. 279. (*e*) Sect. 2. Ch. 4. n. 6. (*f*) p. 506. Clem. Alex.

Diſpenſation which he the Son freely underwent for the Salvation of Mankind; (as I ſhall ſhew hereafter) and that not firſt begun from his Incarnation, but from the Fall of Man. But the Son is truly denied to be the Miniſter, or Servant of the Father, with reſpect to the ſame Divine Nature, which he hath in common with the Father, though communicated by him, *i. e.* as he is not one of the Creatures of God, which are properly ſaid to miniſter to God; but true God, even as the Father. The Son is alſo juſtly call'd the Maker and Creator of all things, as well as the Father, becauſe, though he had the Divine Nature and Omnipotence from the Father, he made all things not by that of another Perſon, but by his own natural Power and Omnipotence. Some of the Antients indeed have ſaid that the Father made this World by the Son, as by an Inſtrument, meaning a connatural, not an extraneous Inſtrument, as *Grotius* hath well obſerv'd ſomewhere. Hence *Irenæus* hath ſaid, that the Son miniſter'd to the Father in the very Creation; who is, notwithſtanding, as ſtrenuous as any Man, in aſſerting the natural Equality of the Father and Son. (*a*) *Juſtin* has fully and exactly comprehended the whole Matter in a few Words, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, where, in his Notes upon this place of *Geneſis*, *The Lord rain'd Fire from the Lord out of Heaven*, he ſaith; The Words of the Prophet ſhew that there were two in number; one on Earth, who ſays, that he deſcended to ſee the Cry of *Sodom*; another in Heaven, who is the Lord of the Lord upon Earth, as being Father, and God and the Cauſe of Exiſtence to him, who is alſo powerful, and Lord and God: I ſay, that from this ſhort Sentence, we have a Key to open the Senſe of all thoſe Places, in which *Juſtin* ſeems to have ſpoken leſs honourably of the Son of God. Here he teaches that God the Father is God, and Lord of his Son: How? As he is the Fountain of the Divinity,

(*a*) Page 358.

and

and the Cauſe of the Son's Exiſtence. The ſame Perſon, notwithſtanding, doth no leſs clearly teach in the ſame Breath, that the Son is God and Lord, even as the Father; or that the Father granted it to the Son, that he ſhould be what he is, God and Lord. The Son then is leſs than the Father, as he hath a Cauſe; but equal to him in Nature. The Son is equally God and Lord as the Father, and in this only differs from the Father, that he is God and Lord from the Father, who is God and Lord of himſelf; *i. e.* as the *Nicene* Synod hath determin'd it, God of God, and very God of very God. We alſo conclude more ſtrongly (if indeed there can be any Difficulty in ſuch plain Words) from hence, that this is *Juſtin*'s Meaning, becauſe in the Words immediately preceding, he deſcribes the Generation of the Son from the Eſſence of the Father, and ſays, that the Son is begotten of the Father, not by a Diviſion of the paternal Eſſence, but by a ſimple Communication, ſuch as is betwixt the Fire that kindles, and the Fire that is kindled.

The Fire kindled, as *Juſtin* elſewhere (*a*) expreſly ſays, is of the very ſame Nature with that from which it was kindled, and only differs in that Communication. Thus the Son is the true Divine Light, as well as the Father, nor is any way inferior to him, but as he is Light of Light, according to another Determination of the *Nicene* Council. And, indeed, to put the Reader in mind of it once for all, whoſoever acknowledges the Son to be conſubſtantial with the Father (which *Juſtin*, and the other Antients, have done to a Man, as I have ſhewn before) he, upon that very account, does by conſequence neceſſarily confeſs that the Son is in Nature equal to the Father. How, I beſeech you, can any one believe the ſame Divine Nature to be common to the Son with the Father, and yet think that the Son wants ſome eſſential Property

(*a*) *See* Sect. 2. chap. 4. n. 3.

of the Divine Nature, and is consequently inferior to the Father? If Christ be the Son of God, and the true Son, namely, begotten of the Essence of the Father, he is necessarily equal to his Father in Nature, *i. e.* in those things which are proper to the Father, as God. This we see in the Propagation of all Animals, especially Men; for all Men are by Nature equal, and only differ in Accidents, which have no place in God, or the Divine Nature. Nay, further, no Substance can be more a Substance or less a Substance than another: If so, then there can be no Question or Controversy concerning the Dissimilitude of those things, which cannot be more or less perfect one than another, namely, of Substances in general, and by consequence of the Divine Substance: But this by the way. I proceed from *Justin* to the other Fathers.

3. *Irenæus* expressly says, that the Father is greater than the Son. (*a*) The Lord, *says he*, is the only true Master for us to learn from, that the Father is above all; for he saith, *the Father is greater than I.* Now we have before shewn, that here he had an especial Regard to the human Nature of Christ. But he saith, (*b*) That the Father commanded the Son to make the World: And *again*, That the (*c*) Son ministreth to the Father in all things; which Words manifestly signify a certain Eminence of the Father above the Son, even as he is most properly the Son of God. Yet the same *Irenæus* saith, (*d*) that the immense Father is measur'd in the Son, and that the Son is the Measure of the Father, because he comprehends him. In this place, I have sufficiently demonstrated before, that the Equality of the Father and Son, as to Nature, is plainly declar'd. Therefore, according to *Irenæus*, the same Son, who, in respect to his Original from the Father, and the Dispensation he undertook, was less than the Father; in respect to his Divine Nature,

(*a*) Page 207. (*b*) p. 334. (*c*) p. 250. (*d*) Vid. supra, Sect. 2. chap. 5. n. 4.

which

which he hath in common with him, is equal to the Father; namely, so as to contain and comprehend him all, how great soever. In like manner, in that *famous Place*, where he compares the Word and the Creatures, he expresly notes this principal Difference, that no Creature is equal to his Maker, God the Father; thereby manifestly signifying that the Word and Son of God is altogether equal to God the Father. *See the entire Place*, Sect. 2. chap. 5. n. 5. But what need of many Words? whosoever has any Scruple in this Matter, let him read Book 2. Chap. 24. of *Irenæus*. There the holy Man is wholly employ'd in shewing against the *Valentinians*, that it is very absurd and blasphemous to say, the Word was imperfect, which proceeded from the perfect Father. In the same Place, he sharply rebukes the same Hereticks, for making their *Nûs* or Mind a perfect *Æon*, and absolutely equal to the Father of all things; yet believing their Word, the Offspring of *Nûs*, to be imperfect, and plac'd in a State of Deminoration, (as the Version hath it.) Of many things in that Chapter to our purpose, we will cite this Place. (*a*) For, *says he*, the Father of all is not (as we have shew'd before) like a certain compounded Animal, something beside the *Nûs* or Mind; but *Nûs* is the Father, and the Father is *Nûs*. It is therefore necessary, that he who is the Word from him, nay, that the very *Nûs*, which is the Word, should be perfect and impassible. And a little after, The *Logos* then (not possessing, * as they speak, the third Order of Generation) was not ignorant of the Father, as they teach. For this will be thought more probable perhaps in the Generation of Men, since they often know not their Parents; but it is absolutely impossible in the Word of the Father. Afterwards he boldly pronounces in the same place, that they are blind to right Reason, who say the Word

(*a*) Page 179.

* *The* Valentinians *said the Word was the Third*, Irenæus *the Second.*

was sent forth in a State of Inferiority. It is then very certain that *Irenæus* acknowledg'd the natural Equality of God the Father, and of his Word, or Son.

4. *Clement* of *Alex.* seem'd to have taught in *a Place (a)* afore-cited, that the Son of God is the next Power after his Father. But the same *Clement* (in a Place, which I have also cited before) says, that the Son is the perfect Word, born of the perfect Father; that is, that the Son is not inferior to the Father in any degree of Perfection. But he speaks yet more expressly in *another place:* The Divine Word, most manifestly God, who is made equal to the Lord of the Universe, for he was his Son, and the Word was in God. Observe, The Word, or Son of God, whom he had in another Place call'd, with respect to his Original, the second from and next to God, he here expressly pronounces as equaliz'd to the Father; and that upon this account, because he is his Son, that is, begotten of him, and of the same Nature and Essence with him; and because the Word is in God, that is, subsists in his Divine Essence, in which there is nothing imperfect. Now it is especially to be observ'd, that in the same Breath, in which he makes the Son equal to the Father, he owns a certain Eminence or Prerogative of the Father above the Son, whilst he calls the Father Lord of all. God the Father namely, is, by way of Distinction, call'd Lord of all, as being the Cause and Original not only of all the Creatures, but of the Son himself, though after a different manner; namely, as he is the Cause of *him*, by an eternal Generation out of his own Essence; of *them*, by a Production out of Nothing, made in Time. *Saving therefore to the Father his Prerogative*, by which he is the Father and Original of every Being, *Clement* teaches * that

(*a*) Sect. 2. chap. 6. n. 6.

* *These Words might have led some late Writers into another way of speaking; for when they assert that the Son is not in Nature the same*

that the Son is equal to him, namely, as he hath the ſame common Nature with him. What *Sandius* anſwers to this Place, is ſtrange indeed. It is plain, *ſays he*, that it is corrupt. Yes, indeed? Can *Sandius* (*a*) then, produce one Book, in which the Place is otherwiſe read? He cannot. But the Sophiſt does as he uſes to do. As often as he is preſs'd with the Teſtimony of any Antient, which he can't otherwiſe elude, he cuts the Knot, which he can't untye; impudently aſſerting, in ſpight of the Conſent of all Copies, that the Place is corrupt, that the Author thought and wrote otherwiſe. But who gave this Trifler ſuch a Power over the Antients, as to reject, as ſpurious, what he does not like? Now, *ſays he*, it appears to be corrupt, by the Reaſon produc'd, becauſe he was his Son. From which Reaſon, it was natural for the *Gentiles* to conclude the quite contrary; for it never enter'd into their Minds to think that the Son was equal to and *coeval* with the Father. But why has *Sandius* added the Word *Coeval?* That Word is not in the Place cited, nor does *Clement* there directly treat of the Son's Coeternity, (he hath aſſerted that in other Paſſages, which we have elſewhere cited) but of his natural Equality with the Father; which he rightly gathers from hence, becauſe he is the true and genuine Son, begotten of his Subſtance, and ſubſiſting in him. This Inference is firm and ſolid in the Judgment of all Men. For the human Father and the human Son are, in reſpect of the ſame human Nature common to both, altogether equal, as I have ſaid before. But if *Clement* had from the ſame Reaſon concluded that the Son is coeval with the Father, he had not miſs'd the Mark: For the Coeternity of the Son neceſſarily follows from his Conſubſtantiality, as we

ſame with the Father, the Reaſon they give for it is, becauſe he is not ſupreme. If they had deſign'd to have brought this Controverſy to an Head, they ſhould have conſider'd the Biſhop's Salvo. I meddle not with the Notion, nor attempt to expoſe, what is ſo manifeſtly unphiloſophical.

(*a*) Appendix ad Nucl. p. 99, *and* 139.

have ſhewn before. For tho in Men the Son muſt be later than his Father, in God Reaſon teaches us the very contrary. No Perſon can begin to exiſt from and in the Divine Eſſence, who was not before, without deſtroying the Immutability of God. Now that God is immutable, is the common Notion of Mankind. Therefore if the Son be the true and genuine Son of God the Father, that is, proceeds from the Subſtance of the Father, and ſubſiſts in him, he muſt be naturally equal to his Father, and alſo coeval and coeternal. Thus *Sandius* at laſt concludes his Anſwer: I ſee not how *Clement* can make the Son equal, who calls him the Miniſter of the Father's Will. But if *Sandius* did not ſee it when he wrote theſe things, he may now ſee it from what we have diſcourſed in this Chapter. Indeed, to ſpeak freely, this profound Writer, by what he hath diſputed in this place, and afterwards, ſeems to be forſaken of the Catholick Faith, and ſound Judgment. God grant him a more ſober Mind.

5. *Tertullian* is the next to *Clement*. He in many places gives the Father a Pre-eminence over the Son. *Petavius*, *Sandius*, and others, have ſo proclaim'd this, that I ſhall not ſpend my time upon it. But the ſame *Tertullian* (which they have generally conceal'd) doth often, and that no leſs plainly and expreſly determine, that the Son is naturally equal to the Father. *Thus*, he ſays, that (*a*) the Father gave all things made by him to the Son †, who is not inferiour to himſelf. *Sandius's* Anſwer to this Place is more worthy Deriſion, than Refutation: For he makes a Difficulty where he finds none. The ſame *Tertullian* expreſly ſaith, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are not only of one Subſtance, but of one Power alſo;

(*a*) P. 440. in fine.

† *We have a critical Suſpicion of Dr.* Whitby's *upon the Reading, but no Authority for altering it, except that then it better ſerved the Doctor's Purpoſe. The Biſhop's Reading has the Authority of the Ancients for it.*

that

that all the Names and Attributes of the Father agree to the Son; and that the Son is equal to the Father; that the Father and Son are join'd, and equaliz'd. We have cited the expreſs Places, which can't be eluded, in *Sect.* 2. *Ch.* 7. *N.* 4. To thoſe you may add theſe: (*b*) *Tertullian* owns, as we have before obſerv'd, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are a Trinity of one Divinity. In theſe Words, it is certain *Tertullian* intended, that all the three Perſons are abſolutely in Nature equal. Thus he ſays againſt *Hermogenes*: Nor ſhall we border upon the *Gentile* Notions, which, when forc'd to confeſs a God, place other Gods below him. But Divinity hath no Degree, as being only one. And *a little* after, The Divinity can never be leſs than itſelf. Whence he expreſly teaches, in the *ſame Book* (*c*), that God had his Wiſdom coexiſting with him from Eternity, as not being inferiour to him, or in State different from him. Here he therefore plainly concludes, that the Wiſdom, or Son of God, is equal to God, whoſe the Wiſdom is, becauſe not in ſtate different from him; that is, conſubſtantial with him. When therefore (*d*) *Tertullian* ſays, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three, not in State, but Degree; by Degree he means Order, and not a greater or leſs Divinity. For thoſe whom he confeſſes to be three in Degree, he denies to be different in State. Now, as we have ſeen, when *Tertullian* ſays any thing is not in State different from another, he means the ſame as if he had ſaid, It is not inferiour to it, but equal and alike. Upon which account he ſays, in the ſame place, a little after, that the three Perſons of the Sacred Trinity are all of one Power, and conſequently none of them more powerful, or excellent than another. Thus the Divinity has no Degree; that is, as *Tertullian* expreſly interprets himſelf, is never inferiour to itſelf: But yet there are Degrees in the Divinity, that is, a certain

(*b*) P. 235. (*c*) p. 239. (*d*) p. 501.

Order

Order of Perſons, of which one takes his Original from another; ſo that the Father is the firſt Perſon exiſting of himſelf, the Son the ſecond from the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt the third, who proceeds from the Father by the Son, or from the Father and the Son. Wherefore ſome Learned Men have unjuſtly charg'd *Tertullian* with the Hereſy of *Apollinaris*, who made Steps or Degrees of Dignity in the Divine Perſons; and, as *Theodoret* (*e*) reports, ſaid, that there was in the Trinity, Great, Greater, and Greateſt; as tho' the Spirit was great, the Son greater, and the Father greateſt. But our very Learned Writer plainly rejected this Dotage. *Novatian*, or the Writer of the Book about the Trinity, inſerted among *Tertullian*'s Works, is of *Tertullian*'s mind. For he, when he makes the Son leſs than the Father, ſo explains himſelf, as to refer this Inferiority to his Original only. His Words are *expreſs* (*f*): It is neceſſary that the Son ſhould be leſs than the Father, as knowing himſelf to be in him, having an Original, becauſe he is born. As for the Divine Nature, the ſame Perſon expreſly teaches, that the Father and Son are one. For *explaining* thoſe Words of our Lord to the *Jews*, *I and the Father are one*, he writes thus (*g*): So as for the Crime of Blaſphemy, he calls himſelf the Son, not the Father; but as to his Divinity, by ſaying * *I and the Father are one*, he hath prov'd, that he is the Son, and God. He is therefore God, but ſo God, as

(*e*) Contra Hæreſ. p. 107. (*f*) p. 729. (*g*) p. 722.

* *It is perfectly nauſeous to obſerve, how often ſome late Writers in this Controverſy have mention'd other Interpretations of theſe Words from this Author, without any Limitation or Exception, or any regard to this. Where the Authors are voluminous, and the Paſſages widely diſtant, ſomething may be ſaid in excuſe; but ſo often to cite an Author, all whoſe Writings don't make* 30 *entire Pages, and neglect to reconcile their Aſſertions from him, with other Paſſages which ſeem to enervate them, looks like writing for a Cauſe, rather than Truth. The Reader will do well to conſult* Tertullian *alſo upon this Text,* (adv. Prax. c. 22, &c.) *and obſerve with what Candour and Ingenuity he is cited in the modeſt Diſquiſitions,* p. 141.

that

that he is the Son, not the Father. The Senſe of the Author is plain: Chriſt, in his Diſcourſe to the *Jews*, preſerv'd both the Pre-eminence of the Father, and alſo his true Divinity equal to the Father's; the one by owning the Father, and confeſſing himſelf the Son; the other, by ſaying that he and the Father are one. Hence the Author infers, that the Son is true God, as well as the Father, with this Difference only, that the one is the Father, the other the Son.

6. *Origen* (*h*) profeſſedly defends the Prerogative of the Father compar'd to the Son: Grant, *ſays he*, that ſome *in the Multitude* of thoſe that believe, and diſſent from us, inconſiderately ſuppoſe that our Saviour is God over all; yet we don't think him ſuch, who are perſuaded by him, when he ſaith, *The Father that ſent me is greater than I.* He laſhes the *Noetians*, as I obſerv'd before, who ſaid our Saviour was the very God the Father, who is called the Lord of all. Againſt them, he ſhews that our Saviour did ſo differ from the Father, as that he was in ſome Senſe inferiour to him. And he gives us this Profeſſion of his, as a common Doctrine of the Church, ranging thoſe with the Heterodox who thought otherwiſe (*i*). A *little after*, when *Celſus* objects to the Chriſtians as their common Sentiment, the Doctrine of *Marcion*, who taught that Jeſus, who is from God the Father, is God Superiour to the Maker of the World, he thus anſwers: For we who ſay that the viſible World is his who made all things, plainly affirm that the Son is not greater than the Father, but leſs. And this we ſay, perſuaded by him who hath told us, *The Father that ſent me is greater than I.* Laſtly, the ſame *Origen* calls the Son the ſecond God (*k*). This notwithſtanding *Origen* in more places than one manifeſtly teaches, that the Son is equal to the Father. Thus, when the *Epicurean Celſus* palm'd this Sentiment upon the Chriſtians, becauſe (*l*) God is great, and not to

(*h*) p. 387. contra Celſum. (*i*) p. 388. (*k*) p. 258. (*l*) p. 323.

be

be beheld, having put his own Spirit into a Body like ours, he ſent him hither, that we might hear and learn of him, he anſwers thus: The God of all, even the Father, is not great alone, as we think. For he hath communicated himſelf and his Greatneſs to the only Begotten, and firſt-born of every Creature, that he being the Image of the inviſible God, might in Greatneſs alſo preſerve the Image of the Father. For it was not poſſible, if I may ſo ſpeak, that he ſhould be a proportionate and true Image of the inviſible God, if he did not repreſent the Image of his Greatneſs. Here you ſee that *Origen*, who elſewhere ſays that the Son is inferiour to the Father, expreſly affirms, that the Father hath even communicated his Greatneſs to the Son, ſo that the Son is equal to his Father in Greatneſs. How will you reconcile theſe things? The Caſe is plain: The Son is inferiour to the Father, with reſpect to his Original; but equal to the Father, as born of him, and having the ſame common Divine Nature with him. The Son is as great as God the Father; but that he is ſo, is owing to the Father. Nay further, the ſame *Origen* (*m*) ſo calls the Son the ſecond God, as to put in this expreſs Caveat, That we are not to underſtand it of any Divine Perfection in the Father, and not in the Son. Theſe are his Words: When we call him the ſecond God, let them know, that by the ſecond God we mean nothing elſe, but a Power comprehenſive of all Powers. Immediately after, he calls the Divine Perſon of Chriſt, the very Word, the very Wiſdom, and Righteouſneſs. *Origen* then very clearly ſignifies, that he and other Catholick Chriſtians, who called Chriſt the ſecond God, never intended to aſcribe to the Son an imperfect Divinity; but, on the other hand, own'd, that the Son was ſo the ſecond God, that he was very God, and not in any Perfection of the Divinity inferiour to the Supreme God, even the Father; there-

(*m*) p. 258.

fore

fore that he was in this ſenſe only called the ſecond God, as he was God of God, and originate of the Father. In a word, *Origen* called the Son ſecond God no otherwiſe, than as *Baſil* call'd the ſame Son ſecond in Order from the Father. Whilſt I read *Origen* thus ſpeaking, how am I griev'd for thoſe Calumniators, who have charg'd this Hereſy upon the very Learned and Holy Father; namely, that the Son, compared with the Father, is a petty God! For without doubt there is ſcarce one of the Primitive Fathers who hath more openly rejected this Blaſphemy.

7. Dionyſius Alexandr. *in his Anſwers to the Queries* ſet after his Epiſtle to *Paulus Samoſat.* thus brings in Chriſt, ſpeaking out of the Prophet *Jeremy:* I Chriſt, a Perſon always exiſting, equal to the Father, as being in nothing unlike him. You may read the entire Place cited, SECT. III. *Ch.* 4. *N.* 3. Now what is clearer than theſe Words? He expreſly ſays the Son is equal to the Father, and proves it, becauſe he is in nothing unlike him; that is, hath the ſame Divine Nature in common with the Father. This is the very thing which we aſſert, that the ancient *Ante-Nicene* Doctors own'd the Son to be naturally equal to the Father. The ſame *Dionyſius*, in the ſame Anſwers, ſays; He is the ſame to whom the Father ſubjected all things, † being not inferiour to the Father, he pray'd for us. Here he expreſly denies that the Son is inferiour to the Father. Laſtly, the ſame Perſon, in his Apology in *Athanaſius*, confeſſes the Trinity indiminiſh'd. By this he can mean nothing elſe, than that the Divinity is not leſs in one Perſon than in another; but that there is in every Perſon an entire, full, and perfect Divinity. See the Place cited at large, SECT. II. *Ch.* 11. *N.* 5.

In like manner, the Creed of *Gregory Thaumaturgus* plainly proclaims a co-eternal and co-equal Trinity: For he clearly aſſerts a perfect Trinity, which is not

† *Or, tho not inferiour*

divided,

divided, or separated in Glory, Government, and Empire. As for the Son in particular, the same Confession teaches, that God the Father is perfect Father of perfect; and then calls the Holy Ghost the perfect Image of the *perfect Son* (*n*). The same *Gregory*, in his Panegyrical Oration upon *Origen*, his genuine Work by the Confession of all Men, as he teaches, that the Son honours and praises the Father, (which shews the Pre-eminence of the Father, as Father, and the Dispensation undertaken by the Son) so he expressly says, that the Father hath honour'd the Son with a Power every way equal to his own, and circumscrib'd his infinite Majesty *in the Son* (*o*). The six Bishops, who wrote an Epistle to *Paulus Samosatenus* in the Name of the whole Synod of *Antioch*, are of this same Opinion. (*p*) These are their express Words concerning the Son of God in that Epistle: He is believ'd to be God by the whole Church under Heaven, having empty'd himself of his Equality to God, and to be Man of the Seed of *David*, according to the Flesh. Here they profess that they have deliver'd the Consent of the Catholick Church; and they plainly interpret the famous Place of St. *Paul* to the *Philippians* (*q*), as the present Catholicks do. Further, the very Creed of *Lucian Martyr*, the great Boast of the *Arians*, expressly teaches, that the Son is not only God of God, but Whole of Whole, and Perfect of Perfect; which Words absolutely exclude that partial and imperfect Divinity of the Son, of which the Hereticks dreamt (*r*). Lastly, The Sense of *Arnobius*, who very often proclaims the Son of God to be true and very God, is *express*: (*s*) God derived, as God, differs not at all from the other. Nor can that, which is one in kind, be more or less in its Parts, still supposing it to keep the Uniformity of its proper Quality. Therefore, according to *Arnobius*, the Son of God, as God, differs not at all

(*n*) Sect. II. ch. 12. n. 1.
(*o*) ——————— n. 4. (*p*) Bibl. Pat. Tom. 11. p. 300.
(*q*) c. 2. v. 6. (*r*) Sect. II. c. 13. n. 5. (*s*) Sect. III. c. 4. n. 9.

from

from God the Father; nor is there more in the Son than in the Father, but in both the Divine Persons the Divinity is uniform; that is, God the Father and the Son, are absolutely equal in Nature. *Arnobius* indeed was of *Tertullian*'s Mind, That the Divinity has no degree, nor is ever less than itself. Yet the same *Arnobius*, in more Places than one, calls God the Father the Supreme God, in the Sense we have before explain'd.

8. Hitherto we have explain'd the Sense of the Antients in the three first Ages. We are now to shew that the Catholick Doctors, who wrote after the Rise of the *Arian* Controversy, and were constant Defenders of the Faith establish'd by the *Nicene* Fathers, agreed with them. *Alexander*, the Bishop of *Alexandria*, who first put a stop to the growing Impiety of *Arius*, in an Epistle * to his Name-sake of *Constantinople*, accurately explains the Catholick Doctrine of the Father's Pre-eminence over the Son in these Words (*g*), We must then take care to preserve to the unbegotten Father his proper Dignity, affirming, that no one is to Him the Cause of Existence. We must also give to the Son the Honour which sutes him, namely, his beginningless Generation of the Father, and as we have said before, attribute Worship to him, and piously and religiously say, that he was, and always was, and before Ages; not rejecting his Divinity, but always ascribing to him the Likeness strictly due to the Image and Character of the Father, esteeming it as the only

* Dr. Whitby *tells us, That this* Alexander *in the beginning of the Dispute waver'd, sometimes commending one Side, sometimes another; but he says nothing of what follows immediately in the same Historian, that at last he got over his Difficulties, asserted the Consubstantiality and Coeternity of the Son, and excommunicated* Arius, &c. *for their Heresy. This unprejudic'd Behaviour, should rather recommend than depreciate the Doctrine he asserted. He also affirms, That this Epistle contains many things which shew he was not Orthodox. Those he instances in, are all agreeable to Antiquity, and the Bishop's Scheme; and the Credit of this single Passage, is sufficient to prove it.*

(*g*) Theodor. E. H. Lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 18.

Pro-

Property or Peculiarity of the Father to be unbegotten; foraſmuch as our Saviour himſelf hath ſaid, *My Father is greater than I*, the Words need no Comment. *Athanaſius* (*h*) his Succeſſor in the See of *Alexandria*, expounding the Words of our Saviour, *My Father is greater than I*, writes thus: The Son did not ſay, the Father is better than I, that no one might ſuppoſe him different in Nature from the Father; but he ſaid, He is greater, not in Majeſty or Age, but upon account of his Generation of the Father.

9. The great *Baſil* (*i*) explains the Matter in theſe Words clearly: Becauſe the Son's Origin is from the Father, the Father is greater, as being the Cauſe, or Origin: for which cauſe the Lord ſays thus, *My Father is greater than I*, namely as Father. Now what does Father ſignify, but to be the Cauſe, or Origin of him that is begotten of him? But even according to your wiſe Notions, Subſtance is by no means ſaid to be greater or leſs than Subſtance. Again (*k*), The Son is indeed the ſecond from the Father, in Order, becauſe *of* him; and in Dignity, becauſe the Father is the Principle, and Cauſe of his Exiſtence. Thus *Gregory Nazianzen* (*l*); To be greater, reſpects Cauſality; to be equal, Nature. And in the ſame Place, he refutes their Interpretation, who would have the Father ſaid to be greater than the Son, as Man, with this excellent Reaſon; For to ſay that he is greater than him, conſider'd as Man, is true indeed, but not much; for what wonder that God is greater than Man? *Laſtly*, He writes thus (*m*), That he is greater is not in Nature, but Cauſality; for none of thoſe things that are Conſubſtantial, are in Subſtance greater or leſs. Upon this Place, *Nicetas* obſerves thus; Becauſe the Son hath his Cauſe from the Father, the Father is greater, as being the Cauſe; but the Eſſence of one, is not by any means greater or leſs than the

(*h*) Orat. 1. contra Arianos. (*i*) Tom. 1. p. 724. Lib. 1. contra Eunom. (*k*) Lib. 3. non longe ab initio. (*l*) Orat. 36. p. 582. (*m*) Orat. 40. p. 669.

Eſſence

Eſſence of another. *Chryſoſtom* ſays (*n*), But if any one ſhall ſay, that the Father is greater, as he is the Cauſe of the Son, we don't contradict it. So *Cyrillus Alexandrinus* (*o*) affirms, that the Father is ſaid to be greater, as he is the Cauſe; theſe are his Words, The Son being equal to the Father in Subſtance, and like him in all things, ſays that He (the Father) is greater as being beginningleſs; whereas he (the Son) hath a Principle only in reſpect of Proceſſion, tho' he hath the ſame Exiſtence with him. Laſtly, *Joannes Damaſcenus* (*p*) ſaith, Now when we ſay that the Father is the Beginning or Principle of the Son, and greater than he, we don't mean that he is before him in Time or Nature (for by him he made the Ages) or any other way, than as being the Cauſe of him; that is, that the Son is of the Father, not the Father of the Son, and that the Father is the natural Cauſe of the Son.

10. We will now cite a few of the many Evidences among the *Latins*. What *Marius Victorinus* ſays for this Sentiment, we have told you *before* (*q*). *Hilary* interprets the Place of St. *John*, the *Father is greater than I*, nicely in theſe Words (*r*), Or is not the Father greater? yes, the Father is greater, as Father; but the Son is not leſs, as Son. The Nativity of the Son makes the Father greater, and the Nature of the Nativity ſuffers not the Son to be leſs. And a little before: The Father is therefore greater, plainly greater than the Son, to whom he granted that he ſhould be as great as he himſelf is; who by the Myſtery of his Nativity makes him the Image of Innaſcibility; whom he begets of himſelf in his own Form. *Again* (*s*), when it is ſaid they are in one another, underſtand the Divinity of God of God; when it is ſaid the Father is greater, underſtand the Confeſſion of the Father's Authority. The Author of the Queſtions in both Teſtaments, which is in the end of the

(*n*) Homil. 72. in Joan. (*o*) In Theſauris, lib. 11. p. 85.
(*p*) De fide Orthod. lib. 1. cap. 6. (*q*) *The preceding Chapter.*
(*r*) In nono Libro de Trin. (*s*) Lib. 11.

fourth Tome of *Auſtine*'s Works, ſays (*t*), He differs not at all in Subſtance, becauſe a true Son; yet he differs in the Degree of Cauſality, becauſe all Power in the Son is from the Father. The Son is not leſs in Subſtance; but the Father is greater in Authority. *Auſtine* himſelf alſo affirms, That the Father is not only greater than the Son, becauſe of his aſſum'd humane Nature, but alſo his eternal Generation. Thus in his *Book* of the Faith and Creed (*u*), where he ſays, thoſe Words of *John* are ſpoken partly becauſe of his taking upon him humane Nature, and partly becauſe the Son oweth what he is to the Father, even this, that he is equal to the Father. But whatever he is, the Father is oblig'd to no one for it. But why do I reckon up the Opinions of particular Doctors? The Catholick Council of *Sardica*, conſiſting of about 200 Eaſtern and Weſtern Biſhops, (250 according to *Theodoret*,) plainly deliver'd the ſame Doctrine in a Synodical Epiſtle. Nor does any one deny (ſay the Fathers) that the Father is greater than the Son, but not as of another Subſtance, or any other Difference, except that the Name of Father is greater than that of Son (*w*).

11. This therefore was the conſtant Opinion of Catholick Antiquity: That we muſt religiouſly preſerve to God the Father his *proper Dignity*, as being only Unbegotten, but ſo, as that we muſt by no means deſtroy the true Divinity of the Son. Nay, it is for the Glory of God the Father that we think worthily of his Son; and on the other hand, he injures and diſgraces the Father, who imagines that he hath begotten an imperfect Son, or determines, that any thing is diminiſh'd in the Divine Nature. The former, *Hilary* hath excellently explain'd in theſe Words (*x*): Being about to ſpeak the abſolute Majeſty, and compleat Divinity of the only begotten Son of God, we don't ſuppoſe any one will think our Diſcourſe con-

(*t*) Queſt. 122. (*u*) Cap. 9. (*w*) Theodoret. lib. 2. cap. 8. p. 82. (*x*) De Trin. lib. 4.

tume-

tumelious to God the Father; as tho' what was refer'd to the Son, was taking away from the Dignity of the Father; since rather the Honour of the Son is the Honour of the Father, and he must be a glorious Author, from whom proceeded so glorious a Person: For the Son hath nothing but what is begotten, and the Admiration of the Honour begotten, must redound to the Honour of him that begat it. The Notion of Contumely ceases then, when whatsoever Majesty is taught to be in the Son shall redound to enlarge his Power, *shall tend to make his Power appear more glorious*, who begat such an one. *Zeno Veronensis*, or whoever is the Author of the Discourse ascrib'd to *Zeno*, upon these Words: *When he shall have deliver'd up the Kingdom to God, even the Father*, hath clear'd the latter as well (*y*): The Father possesseth the whole, so doth the Son, what belongs to one, belongs to both; what one possesses, is each one's; as our Lord saith, *All things, whatsoever the Father hath, are mine*; for the Father abideth in the Son, and the Son in the Father; to whom he is gloriously subject in Affection, not Condition; in Love, not Necessity; by whom the Father is always honour'd. Lastly, He saith, *I and the Father are one.* Upon which account, as I said, the Son is subjected to the Father not in a diminutive, but religious Subjection; for as much as one Possession of an original and perpetual Kingdom, one Substance of Coeternity and Omnipotence, one Equality, one Power of the august Majesty, one Dignity is retain'd in an united Light; for if you take any thing from the Son, you'll injure the Father, whose Whole he hath; nor is there any thing in him, which is inferior; because as the Father, so he can neither have more nor less. The one is infus'd into the Fullness of the other; so that the Blessed God is all in all, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father with the Holy Spirit, *Amen.*

(*y*) Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2. Col. 424.

12. This famous Paſſage of *Zeno* puts me in mind of a remarkable Story in *Sozomen*, with which I will conclude this Chapter (z). When *Theodoſius the Great* was Emperor, and came to ſee *Conſtantinople*, the Biſhops who were in the City went to the Palace to ſalute him, according to Cuſtom; amongſt them, it is ſaid, there was a certain old Man, the Biſhop of an obſcure City, plain indeed, and not well ſeen in Civil Affairs, but a good Divine. The other Biſhops in a courtly and reſpectful manner complemented their Prince, ſo did the old Man alſo: however, he did not honour the Emperor's Son as the others had done; but approaching him as a Boy, ſaid, God ſave thee, Son! and began to ſtroke him with his Hand. The Emperor was mov'd, and reſenting it as an injury done to his Son, that he was not equally honour'd as himſelf, commanded the old Biſhop to be expell'd with Diſgrace. As they were removing him, he turn'd and ſaid, Thus think, O King, that the Heavenly Father is angry at thoſe who honour not the Son with equal Honour, and preſumptuouſly ſay, that he is leſs than him, that begat him. In theſe Words the pious Man rubb'd the *Arians*, who were as yet numerous from the Favour ſhewn them by the Emperors *Conſtantius* and *Valens*, and very freely aſſembling together, diſcours'd concerning God and his Subſtance, and perſuaded the Favourers of their Faith at Court to attempt the Emperor. The Emperor, ſtruck with the Saying, call'd back the Biſhop, and having ask'd his pardon, confeſs'd he had ſaid true.

(z) Sozom. lib. 7. chap. 6. p. 577.

CHAP.

CHAP III.

A large Answer to the Objection, against what has been said in the former Chapter, taken from those Places of the Ancients, in which they seem to have denied the Immensity and Invisibility of the Son of God.

THE Testimonies of the Antients, which we have mentioned in the former Chapter, concerning the absolute natural Equality of the Father and Son, saving to the Father, as Father, his Pre-eminence, are very clear. Now we have observed upon, and explain'd most of those Sayings of the Antients, which seem to contradict these, in the second Section, and the third, where we explain their Notion of the Eternity and Consubstantiality of the Son particularly. There is yet one Knot to be unty'd, and that very well worthy our Labour; which we have therefore reserv'd for this Place, because it is not in one, or two of the Primitive Fathers, but almost runs through all their Works. I confess I once stumbled at that Stone my self, and therefore think it my Duty to endeavour the removing it. The ancient Catholicks then, who were before *Arius*, seem almost all of them to have known nothing of the Son of God's invisible and immense Nature. For sometimes they so speak of the Son of God, as tho' he was in his Divine Nature finite, visible, included in some determinate Place, and circumscribed by certain Bounds. When they would prove that he, who formerly appear'd to thePatriarchs and Holy Men under the Old Testament, and spoke to them, being graced with the Title *Je-*

hovah, was the very Son of God, they generally uſe this disjunctive Argument: That he who appeared, was either the Son of God, or a created Angel, or God the Father. That he was not a created Angel they conclude, becauſe he is called by the Holy Spirit, *Jehovah* and God; that it was not the Father they prove, becauſe he is immenſe, filling all Places, included in none, and therefore it is impious to think that he appeared in ſome certain Place, and little Corner of the Earth; as tho' it might be ſafely ſaid of the Son of God. After the like manner the ſame Perſons teach that the Son of God is viſible.

2. Thus one of the moſt ancient Fathers, *Juſtin Martyr* in his Dialogue with *Trypho*. There when *Trypho* denies that the Angel which appeared to *Moſes* in the burning Buſh, was very God, and aſſerts that an Angel did indeed appear in a Flame of Fire, but that God, namely the Father, talk'd with *Moſes*, ſo that there was in the Viſion two, God and the Angel; *Juſtin* anſwers thus, (*a*) Grant, my Friend, that this was done, namely, that both God and an Angel appeared to *Moſes* in a Viſion; and not that it was as I have demonſtrated to you before: yet that God was not the Maker of this Univerſe, who ſaid to *Moſes*, I am the God of *Abraham*, and of *Iſaac*, and of *Jacob*; but the ſame which I before ſhew'd to have been ſeen by *Abraham*, and *Jacob*, namely, he, who miniſters to the Will of the Maker of all things, and who alſo miniſter'd to his Will and Purpoſe in the Judgment upon *Sodom*. So that, tho' it be as you affirm, that there were two, namely, God and an Angel, no wiſe Man will preſume to ſay that the Author and Parent of all things left all his heavenly Manſions, and exhibited his Preſence in a ſmall part of the Earth. There is a parallel Place to this elſewhere in this *Dialogue*. *Theophilus Antiochenus* hath uſed the ſame way of reaſoning (*b*). So *Irenæus*, *Origen*, and the ſix Biſhops, who

(*a*) P. 282. *and* 283. (*b*) P. 100. *Append.* Juſtin.

wrote

wrote the Epiſtle from the Synod of *Antioch* to *Paulus Samoſatenus*, as we ſhall cite them hereafter.

3. Of the *Latins*, *Tertullian* hath the ſame: (*c*) But how could he walk in Paradiſe in the Evening, ſeeking *Adam*, and ſhut the Ark after *Noah* was gone into it, and refreſh himſelf with *Abraham* under the Oak, *&c.* who is the omnipotent inviſible God, whom no Man hath ſeen, nor can ſee, who dwelleth in the Light, which is inacceſſible, who dwelleth not in Temples made with Hands, at whoſe Sight the Earth trembles, the Mountains melt as Wax, who holdeth the whole World in his Hand, as a Neſt, to whom the Heaven is a Throne, and the Earth a Footſtool, in whom is all Place, and he not in any, who is the extreme Line of the Univerſe, and the moſt High? Theſe things indeed could not have been believ'd of the Son of God, except they had been written; but are not to be believ'd of the Father tho' written, whom they bring down into *Mary*'s Womb, ſet before *Pilate*'s Tribunal, and ſeal up in *Joſeph*'s Tomb. The Error then appears to be from this; that being ignorant that the Order of Divine Diſpenſation did from the beginning paſs thro' the Son; they believ'd that the Father appear'd, and conferr'd, and wrought, *&c.* *Novatian*, or the Author of the Book about the Trinity, among the Works of *Tertullian*, follows him in this, as in other Matters (*d*): But if the ſame *Moſes* every where repreſents God the Father as Immenſe, Infinite, not included in Place, but who includes all Place, not in any Place, but rather all Place in him, containing and comprehending all things, ſo that he cannot properly aſcend or deſcend, as containing and filling all things; and yet nevertheleſs introduces God deſcending to the Tower which the Sons of Men built, conſidering and ſaying, *Come and let us deſcend*, &c. What God would they have it to be that deſcended, and was about to viſit thoſe Men? God the Fa-

(*c*) Page 510. (*d*) P. 723.

ther? then he is included in Place, and then how does he comprehend all things? Or does he say, that an Angel descending with Angels spoke, *Come let us*, &c. But we observe in *Deuteronomy* that God said these things, *&c.* Therefore then the Father did not descend as the Case shews, nor did an Angel command or exhort, *&c.* as the thing proves. It remains then that he descended, of whom the Apostle *Paul* speaks, *He that descended, is the same that ascended*, &c. that is, the Son of God, the Word of God.

4. Who would not be amaz'd at these strange Sayings of the Antients? that they should be so dull and inconsistent, as to say, that the Son of God, whom in other Places they frequently call very God of very God, is circumscrib'd within the narrow Bounds of one small Place, and to believe him in his own Nature visible. Far be it from us, to think so of the greatest Men. You'll say then, what Remedy can you find for this Disease? I am clearly of Opinion that those Antients who spoke something harshly of this Matter, did not properly and justly express their otherwise true Sentiment. They had to deal with Adversaries, who positively deny'd, that the Father was personally distinct from the Son, and in the heat of Opposition, did not express themselves with due caution. Any one who will look into the Authors, will plainly see that this is the Case in those Sayings of *Justin*, *Tertullian*, and *Novatian*, which I have recited entire. These, as well as the other I have mention'd, meant no more by such Expressions, than that the Son of God, who is every where with his Father, and equally invisible as his Father, was by Dispensation seen in some certain Places, that is, shew'd himself to Men by certain external Symbols of his Presence, bringing to them the Will and Commands of God the Father. But you'll say, if these Fathers, tho' they affirm, and plainly enough hint, That the Son of God was some time shut up in the narrow Compass of a certain Place, and seen by Men, meant no more, than that he exhibited

hibited in certain Places ſome ſenſible Symbols or Tokens of his Preſence, why do they ſo cautiouſly remove this Thing from God the Father as unworthy of him? For it ſeems that God the Father alſo might, without any diminution of his Majeſty, have manifeſted himſelf to Men. I anſwer, the Primitive Doctors did not think ſo; for according to them, God the Father neither was, nor cou'd be ſeen by any one, even in aſſum'd Forms. He had no Beginning, was ſubject to none; nor cou'd any more be ſaid to be ſent of another, than born of another. On the other hand, the Son of God, as born of God the Father, does certainly upon that account owe all his Authority to the Father; nor is it leſs honourable to him to be ſent by the Father, than to be born of him. He is of the Father, by him the Father made all things that are in the World, and afterwards, by him, communicated himſelf to the World. Tho' there is no diſparity of Nature in the Holy Trinity between the Father and the Son, yet there is a certain Order, according to which, the Father is the Principle and Head of the Son. This Order wou'd be inverted, if the Adminiſtration was the Son's by the Father, not the Father's by the Son. To come nearer to the propos'd Objection: The primitive Fathers refer'd all thoſe Apparitions formerly made to Holy Men, to the Diſpenſation of Man's Salvation, which Diſpenſation they thought the Son of God had undertaken, not then firſt, when he came in the Fleſh, but from the very Fall of the firſt Man, as is before ſhewn: but they always thought that that very Diſpenſation was foreign to God the Father. The Catholick Church of Chriſt always acknowledged againſt the *Patripaſſians*, that the Incarnation, which the Son underwent, did not become God the Father, for the ſame Reaſon for which the Antients aſſerted, That thoſe Appearances did not belong to the Father, but the Son; namely, becauſe they really were Preludes of the Incarnation. That this was the very meaning of the

An-

Antients, two Things prove; becauſe they all elſewhere frequently confeſs, that the Son is in his Nature immenſe and inviſible, as the Father; and becauſe moſt of them do interpret theſe their Sayings expreſly of the Diſpenſation. Now we will confirm our Anſwer, by particularly examining thoſe Sayings of the Antients, which we have mention'd, and comparing them with other expreſs Sayings of theirs.

5. *Juſtin Martyr*, who, in his Dialogue with *Trypho* contends, that the Perſon who appear'd to *Moſes* in the Buſh, was the Son of God, becauſe it would be abſurd to ſay, that God the Father appear'd in a little Corner of the Earth; as though it might, without Abſurdity, be ſaid of the Son of God: This *Juſtin* ſpeaks elſewhere very honourably of that very Perſon. For, in his Exhortation to the *Greeks*, he writes thus: (*a*) For, I ſuppoſe, it was neceſſary that he who was to be the Prince and Leader of the *Hebrews*, ſhould firſt know the God of all things. Wherefore having appear'd to him firſt, as far as it was poſſible for God to appear to Man, he ſaid to him, *I am he that is*. The God then that appear'd to *Moſes* in the burning Buſh, appear'd not otherwiſe than became God, that is, not by paſſing from Place to Place, or ſo as to be included in the narrow Bounds of ſome Place; but he manifeſted himſelf to the Holy Prophet, by forming a viſible Appearance, and an audible Voice. A little after he ſays, as we have noted before, that the Deſcription, by which the Perſon appearing in the Buſh ſignify'd himſelf to *Moſes*, *I am he that is*, was ſuitable to God, who always exiſts. Now that *Juſtin* acknowledg'd the always exiſtent God to be in his own Nature immenſe and inviſible, no Man can doubt. Thoſe things therefore which *Juſtin* hath elſewhere ſaid concerning that divine Perſon which appear'd to *Moſes*, that he appear'd as though included in a little Corner of the Earth, are

(*a*) Page 20.

to

to be referr'd to the Diſpenſation I ſpoke of, which the Son undertook. The ſame *Juſtin* explains the Matter more clearly in the Apology commonly call'd the Second, where he again contends, (*b*) that it was our Saviour who talked with *Moſes* out of the Buſh, in the Appearance of Fire, ſaying, *Looſe thy Shoes, come hither and hear.* And a little after, he clearly teaches, that Chriſt, in his own Perſon, ſaid thoſe Words; *I am he that is, the God of* Abraham, &c. (*c*) What is ſaid to *Moſes* out of the Buſh, (ſays he) *I am he that is, the God of* Abraham, *and the God of* Iſaac, *and the God of* Jacob, *and the God of thy Fathers,* is ſignificative of this, That they, though dead, did remain, and belong'd to Chriſt. But what manner of Appearance could be ſuitable to the Son of God, if the always exiſtent God, *the God of* Abraham, *&c.* which would not become the Father? *Juſtin* himſelf hath ſolv'd the Difficulty in the ſame place. For tho' Chriſt be the genuine Son of God, and always exiſtent, and *the God of* Abraham, *&c.* as well as the Father; yet as *Juſtin* ſpeaks, he is the Angel and Apoſtle of God the Father, appointed by the Father for this end, to tell Men his Will. Whilſt he doth this Office, he doth nothing unworthy himſelf; nor, as I before ſaid, is it leſs honourable to be ſent of the Father, than to be born of him. The Words of *Juſtin* are (*d*), The Word of God is his Son, as we have ſaid before, and he is call'd Angel and Apoſtle. For he tells us what is proper to be known, and is ſent to ſhew us what is told. Now that all theſe things belong to that Diſpenſation, which the Son of God undertook from the Riſe of the Church, and at length compleated by his Incarnation, the bleſſed Martyr plainly ſignifies a little after. This (*e*) Diſcourſe is to ſhew that Chriſt is the Son of God, and his Apoſtle, being *before*, the Word, and ſometime ſeen in an Appearance of Fire, ſometime in the Image of incor-

(*b*) Pag. 95. (*c*) p. 96. (*d*) p. 95. (*e*) p. 96.

poreal

poreal Things; but *now*, by the Will of God, being made Man for the ſake of Mankind. To the ſame purpoſe *Juſtin*, in the Dialogue with *Trypho*, after he hath enumerated the Titles given our Saviour in Scripture, namely, the Glory of the Lord, the Son, the Wiſdom, the Angel, God, Lord and Word, immediately adds, (*f*) He is to be call'd by all theſe Names from his miniſtring to the Father's Will, and being freely born of the Father. Now, without doubt, he referr'd the Name Angel to his miniſtring to the Father's Will; as he did the other Appellations, Glory of the Lord, Son, Wiſdom, Word, to the Divine Generation of the Father. Moreover, it is manifeſt, *Juſtin* acknowledg'd the Omnipreſence of the Son of God, both from other Places, and alſo from theſe expreſs Words in his Apology, commonly call'd *the Firſt*: (*g*) The Word was and is exiſtent in all, *&c.* There he teaches that the Word, alſo call'd the Son of God, does, as it were, penetrate and pervade the whole Compaſs of the Creation, and is preſent in all things; and therefore can't be confin'd in any Place, much leſs in a little Corner of the Earth. In the ſame Senſe, the Father himſelf is in Scripture (*h*) ſaid to be *through all*, and in all. The ſame *Juſtin* thought that the Son of God, as moſt properly ſuch, was not the Object of Sight, nor could be comprehended by the Mind of Men or Angels: for in a remarkable Place, which I have before cited from the Epiſtle to *Diognetus*, he calls the Son of God the holy and incomprehenſible Word and Truth (*i*). Thus much for *Juſtin*.

6. From *Irenæus*, the Matter will yet be clearer. (*k*) The Word (ſays he) was made the Diſpenſer of the Father's Grace, for the Benefit of Men, for whom he made ſuch glorious Diſpoſitions, ſhewing God to Man, and Man to God; and preſerving the

(*f*) Pag. 284. (*g*) p. 48 *and* 49. (*h*) Eph. iv. 6. (*i*) Sect. 2. Ch. 4. n. 7. (*k*) p. 371.

Inviſi-

Inviſibility of the Father, that Man ſhould not deſpiſe God, and ſhould always have ſomething to attain to; but ſhewing God viſible to Men by many Diſpoſitions, leſt Man wholly going off from God, ſhould ceaſe to be. In theſe Words, he teaches us, as *Petavius* himſelf has obſerv'd, that the Father never appear'd, nor was ſo much as diſguis'd under ſome outward Shape: but that the Word ſhew'd himſelf to the Antients, not in himſelf, not in his proper Subſtance, but under ſome Likeneſs. I add, that *Irenæus* doth here expreſly ſay, that in all the Manifeſtations of God the Father by his Word, the Word was the Diſpenſer of the Father's Grace, for the Benefit of Man; that is, that all the Appearances of the Son of God belong (as I have ſaid) to that Diſpenſation, which he took upon him from the Beginning, for the Salvation of Men. We have a Place parallel to this in the ſame Chapter: (*a*) Therefore if neither *Moſes* ſaw God, nor *Elias*, nor *Ezekiel*, who ſaw many heavenly Viſions; and if thoſe things which were ſeen by them, were Likeneſſes of the Lord's Glory, and Prophecies of what was to come; it is manifeſt the Father is inviſible, of whom the Lord alſo ſaid, *No one hath ſeen God at any time*; but his Word, according to his Pleaſure, hath ſhew'd the Glory of the Father, to the Advantage of thoſe that behold him, and laid open his Diſpoſitions; as alſo the Lord hath ſaid, The only begotten, who is in the Boſom of the Father, hath declar'd, *&c.* And in another place *Irenæus* expreſly tells us, (*b*) That all thoſe Appearances of the Son of God under the Old Teſtament, were Preludes, and, as it were, Specimens of the future Incarnation, and had all of them a View to the Œconomy of our Salvation, which the Son had undertaken: It is he who ſays to *Moſes*, *I have ſurely ſeen the Vexation of my People in* Egypt, *and am come down to deliver them.* The Word of God being accuſtom'd from the Beginning to aſcend and

(*a*) Pag. 372. (*b*) p. 344.

deſcend

descend, for the help of those who were in Trouble. But then *Irenæus* plainly asserts, that the Son of God is, in his own Nature, invisible as well as the Father. (*a*) For he says, we are taught by the Christian Religion, that there is one God, who is above all Principality and Dominion, and Power, and every Name that is named; and that his Word is naturally invisible, but was made visible and palpable among Men, and descended even to Death, the Death of the Cross. Here also *Irenæus* (which, perhaps, is worthy our Notice by the way) in these Words, [the Word naturally invisible, but made visible and palpable among Men, and descended to Death] seems to me to have in his Eye a remarkable Passage in the Epistle of *Ignatius* to *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*'s Master; in which the Apostolical Man calls Christ the Son of God invisible, but visible for our sakes, impalpable, and impassible, but passible for our sakes. *See the entire Place*, Sect. 3. Chap. 1. n. 3. Again, *Irenæus* (*b*) explains the whole Matter clearly, and teaches that the Father and Son are indeed equally incomprehensible by the Creatures, and equally comprehensible by one another; yet that all the Manifestation of the Father is made by the Son, and therefore that the Father sends, and the Son is sent: These are the Words, But since the only begotten Son came to us (*contracting his own Substance into himself*) from the One God, who made this World, form'd us, contains and administers all things, I have a strong Faith in him, and an immoveable Love towards the Father, God giving me both. For no one can know the Father, but by the Revelation of the Word, that is, the Son of God; nor the Son, but by the Good Pleasure of the Father. Now the Son fulfils the Good Pleasure of the Father: For the Father sends, and the Son is sent. And his own Word knows the Father, who is indeed invisible, and infinite as to us: Tho' he is not to be declar'd [by us]

(*a*) Page 379. (*b*) p. 330.

he

he declares him to us. Again, the Father alone knows his Word. Now the Lord hath ſhewn that both theſe things are thus; and for this Reaſon, the Son declares the Knowledge of the Father, by the Manifeſtation of himſelf. For the Knowledge of the Father is the Manifeſtation of the Son; for all things are manifeſted by the Word. Theſe things ſufficiently prove that *Irenæus* was ſound and catholick.

7. What *Clement* of *Alexandr.* has diſcours'd upon this Matter, is clearer than the Light. For he joins the Immenſity and Omnipreſence of the Son of God with the Œconomy undertaken by him in this very notable Paſſage: (*c*) The Son of God is never out of his Watch-Tower. Not divided, or ſever'd, not paſſing from place to place; but being always every where, and not circumſcribed, all Mind, all paternal Light, all Eye, ſeeing all things, hearing all things, knowing all things, by his Power ſearching all Powers. To him all the Hoſt of Angels and Gods is ſubject, to the paternal Word, who hath undertaken the Diſpenſation becauſe of him who ſubjected. Obſerve! He clearly teaches, that the Word, or Son of God, is not divided, or ſever'd, paſſes not from place to place, is always every where, and no where circumſcrib'd. Nevertheleſs, he allows that the very Son of God undertook the Holy Diſpenſation laid upon him by God the Father; namely, then under the Old Teſtament, when he appear'd to the Prophets, and Holy Men, in the diſguiſe, either of a Man, or ſome other corporeal Thing; then eſpecially under the New, when, having taken very Man into the Unity of his Perſon, he converſed with Men upon Earth. Sure nothing can be more expreſs than this. That ſhameleſs Scribbler *Sandius* (*d*) impudently denies, contrary to the Faith of all Copies, that *Clement* wrote thus: but he is fitter to be hiſs'd than anſwer'd.

(*c*) Page 505, &c. (*d*) Append. ad Nucl. p. 99.

8. *Ter-*

8. *Tertullian*, who told us *before*, That it was the Son, not the Father, who formerly appear'd to Holy Men, and in the Fulneſs of Time was incarnate, becauſe the Father is inviſible, and not to be included in Place: The ſame (*e*) *afterward* expreſly tells us, That it is not to be underſtood of a Diſparity of Nature in the Father, and the Son, ſince they are mutually inſeparable, both equally immenſe, and omnipreſent; but of the Œconomy, which the Son, not the Father, undertook. For thus he writes upon that Place, in the 17th Chapter of St. *Matthew*: You have the Son on Earth, the Father in him; this is not a Separation, but a Divine Diſpoſition. But you are to know that God is in the Abyſſes, is every where by his Force and Power; that the Son alſo, as indiviſible, is every where with him. Notwithſtanding in the Œconomy the Father would have the Son on Earth, himſelf in Heaven, to which Place the Son looking up, pray'd and begg'd of the Father; whither he hath alſo taught us to lift ourſelves up, and to pray, *Our Father, which art in Heaven*, whereas he is alſo every where. The Reaſon is the ſame of the Divine Œconomy before the Incarnation, even of all the Appearances under the Old Teſtament. For as *Tertullian* hath excellently told us *before*, all the Order of the Divine Œconomy, from the Beginning, paſſes through the Son. In like manner *Novatian*, (as before) when he had prov'd that it was the Son, who came down to the Tower of *Babel*, &c. for this reaſon, that God the Father was immenſe, and not included in Place, as tho the Son was not alſo immenſe and omnipreſent; yet in another place, in the ſame Book, he expreſly attributes to the Son of God that Immenſity and Omnipreſence which is proper to the Divine Nature. (*f*) For he thus *maintains* the true Divinity of the Son againſt Hereticks: If Chriſt is only Man, how is he preſent every where, when invok'd, ſince it is not the

(*e*) Page 513 *and* 514. (*f*) p. 717. (*g*) p. 724.

Nature

Nature of Man, but of God, to be every where? How then are these Appearances of God to Holy Men in former Times to be thought compatible with the Son, not the Father also? The *Author* himself, I think, hath clearly taken away that Difficulty, where he thus discourses concerning the Angel which appear'd to *Sarah*'s Maid: (*a*) Let the Hereticks consider what they will say to the Place before us: Was it the Father who was seen by *Agar*, or not? For it is said, God. Far be it from us to say the Angel is God the Father, lest he, whose the Angel is, be subject to another. But they'll say it was an Angel. How then God, if an Angel, since that Name is not ever allow'd to Angels? The Truth which lies on both sides concludes us in this Opinion, that we are to understand it to be the Son of God; who, as of God, is justly call'd God, because the Son of God; and as subject to God, and the Preacher of the Father's Will, is call'd the Angel of the Great Counsel. The Sum is this: He who appear'd to *Agar*, was either a created Angel, or an uncreated God. He proves he was no Angel, because call'd God and Jehovah, an incommunicable Name, and never given any Creature, not even to Angels, the supreme Order of Creatures. It is plain then, that it was the true God; but, if I may so speak, what God? The Father, or the Son? That it was not the Father, he proves, because the Name of an Angel suggests Mission from another, and consequently a certain Subjection; but God the Father is subject to none, as being of himself. It remains therefore, that he who appear'd be the Son of God; who is subject to the Father, as having his Original from him, and to whom the Office of an Angel, or Preacher of the Father's Will, is not unbecoming. In a word, God the Father could not be an Angel, and preserve his Pre-eminence as Father; for then he would have been sent by another,

(*a*) Page 724.

who hath no Dependence upon another: But to the Son of God, the Name God truly agrees, as being very God; and the Name Angel, as being ſo true God, as to be God of God, and therefore capable to receive and undertake from God, of whom he is, the Miſſion or Oeconomy committed, without Injury to the Dignity of his Perſon. This very thing was, no doubt, intended by the Fathers, who wrote the Synodical Epiſtle from the Council of *Antioch* to *Paul* of *Samoſata*. They contend that the Son is he, who every now and then appear'd to and conferr'd with the Fathers under the Old Teſtament: Sometimes atteſted as an Angel, ſometimes as Lord, and ſometimes as God. For believe, it is impious to call the God of the Univerſe an Angel, but the Son is the Angel of the Father, tho' himſelf Lord and God. For it is written, *The Angel of the Great Counſel.* Where the Holy Prelates clearly teach, that the Titles of *God* and *Lord* agree to the Father, and conſequently to the Son; but that the Title of *Angel*, as ſignifying a Miſſion from another, does by no means agree to the Father, who can no more be ſaid to be ſent by another, than to be born of another; but may be rightly attributed to the Son, who is begotten of the Father, who is therefore in Scripture call'd the Angel of the *Great Counſel.*

9. *Tertullian* (*a*) is to be expounded after the ſame manner, *where* he diſtinguiſhes the Son from the Father, becauſe he is viſible, but the Father inviſible. In this alſo *Novatian*, or the Author of the Book concerning the Trinity, imitates him. Can any one ſuſpect that *Tertullian*, and his Ape (no Fools) believed the Son of God, as God, and born of the inviſible God, to be viſible? Without doubt they ſaid the Son was viſible, not in his own Nature, but according to the Oeconomy before explain'd, in which he ſometimes from the Beginning ſhew'd himſelf to

(*a*) Page 508.

Men

Men by certain external and visible Symbols of his Presence. If you question this, hear *Tertullian*, in the same Book and Chapter, very express in explaining himself: For we say that the Son is upon his own account so far invisible, as he is the Word and Spirit of God from the *Condition* [*or Nature*] of his Substance, even as he is God, and the Word and Spirit; but that before he was incarnate, he was visible after the manner he speaks of, to *Aaron* and *Miriam*: *And if there be a Prophet among you, I will be known to him in a Vision*, &c. What can be clearer? *Sandius* then and others, may be asham'd so confidently to fix upon *Tertullian* this absurd Opinion, that he believ'd the Word and Son of God to be in his own Nature finite and visible. For, if they had ever attentively read that Book of *Tertullian*, from which they gather'd it, they could not but know that the learned Writer rejected it in so many Words. If they knew this, and yet would palm it upon *Tertullian*, what are they to be accounted but Sophisters and Prevaricators? But if they never read the Book, or never read it with Attention, sure they are very rash Persons, from such slender Grounds to say what *Tertullian*'s Opinion was.

10. I come at length to *Origen*. He *teaches* that God the Father condescended to Men, not locally, but providentially; the Son locally, in former Days, in feign'd or assum'd Shapes; in the last Times having put on real Man: but yet so as that he was never included in Place, but was and is always every-where, as well as the Father. These are his Words: (*a*) God therefore, according to his Goodness, condescends to Men, not locally, but providentially. And the Son of God was not then only, but is always with his own Disciples, fulfilling that which he said, *Behold, I am with you alway, to the end of the World*. If a Branch can't bring forth Fruit, except it remain in the Vine,

(*a*) Page 239. contra Cels.

neither can the Disciples of the Word, the spiritual Branches of the true Vine, the Word, bring forth the Fruit of Virtue, unless they abide in the true Vine, the Christ of God, who was locally with us here below, upon Earth; who is with those who every where adhere to him, yea, and with those also every where, who don't know him. This *John* tells us in his Gospel, in the Person of *John* the Baptist, who said, *He stands in the midst of you, whom ye know not; it is he who cometh after me.* From this he immediately infers, that Prayers and Vows are not to be made to the Sun, Moon and Stars, but to God the Father and the Son, who are every-where present. So Book the Second, (*a*) he proves by Testimonies of Scripture, that the Son of God is not circumscrib'd in the Body he hath assum'd, but is every-where. And he very clearly reconciles the Descents of the Son of God to Men, with his Immensity and Omnipresence, *Book* 4. where, when *Celsus* objects against the Incarnation of the Son of God, that if God descends to Men, it is to be fear'd he leaves his Throne, he thus answers, (not in his own name only, but in the name of all Christians) (*b*) For he knew not the Power of God, and that the Spirit of the Lord fill'd the World, and that he who comprehendeth all things, *hath Knowledge of the Voice.* Nor can he understand this: *Don't I fill Heaven and Earth, saith the Lord?* Neither doth he consider, that according to the Christian Word, we all live, and move, and exist in him; as also St. *Paul* taught in his Sermon to the *Athenians.* Therefore though the God of all things doth by his Power descend with Jesus for the Life of Man; tho' he, who in the Beginning was the Word with God, who also was God, comes to us, he is not out of his Seat, he hath not left his Throne, as though any Place could be empty of him, and another full, which had him not before. For the Power and Deity of

(*a*) Pag. 63. contra Cels. (*b*) p. 164.

God

God *goeth* as it pleaſeth, and where it findeth room, not changing the Place, nor leaving the Room empty of *him, and filling another.* Can *Sandius* ſay, as he did juſt now of *Clement*, that theſe Words are ſuppoſititious, and not written by *Origen?* He may, if he pleaſes; but no Man, in his Senſes, will pay any Regard to the raſh Creature's Opinion: eſpecially when it appears that *Origen* delivers the ſame Doctrine in this very Book, and in *many other Places.* (*a*) Let the Wretch at length learn from *Origen*, whom he eſpecially, but erroneouſly admires, and cites, as of *Arius's* Opinion, his own Ignorance; who profeſſes he never can think, that the Son of God deſcended to the Earth, without going from place to place: ſo that even then, when he was made Man, and convers'd with Men, he was preſent in Heaven, yea, everywhere; and condemns the Opinion as wicked and blaſphemous. The holy Man truly has in the Perſon of *Celſus*, the *Epicurean*, pronounc'd him wholly ignorant of the divine Power.

11. I will add this by way of Appendix: It is very probable, that from the Words of Chriſtian Writers, who taught that the Appearances of God, mention'd in the Old Teſtament, are not to be underſtood of the Father, whom no Man can ſee; but ought to be referr'd to the Son, and that the Incarnation agreed to the Son, not the Father: I ſay from theſe, not rightly underſtood, it is very probable *Celſus* took an handle to object to the Chriſtians, as though they taught that God the Father, himſelf great, and *inviſible, or difficult to be contemplated*, ſent his Son, made viſible, or *viſible*, or *eaſy to be contemplated*, to Men. This we have obſerv'd *before* of him, and have given part of *Origen's* Anſwer to it. The other part is alſo very appoſite, for thus he proceeds: (*b*) Grant then that God is difficult to be contemplated; but he alone is not difficult to be contemplated: His only begot-

(*a*) Pag. 168, 169, 170. 324, 325. (*b*) p. 323.

ten is likewiſe ſo. For God the Word is alſo difficult to be contemplated, and ſo is his Wiſdom, by which he made all things. Who can particularly contemplate the Wiſdom by which God made every thing? Therefore God did not ſend his Son, a God eaſy to be contemplated, becauſe he was difficult; as *Celſus*, not underſtanding our Meaning, hath ſaid for us;—but, as we have reply'd, though the Son, as God the Word, by whom all things were made, was difficult to be contemplated, yet he dwelt among us. In theſe Words *Origen* again profeſſes, in the name of all Chriſtians, that the Father did not therefore ſend the Son into the World, becauſe he was eaſier to be contemplated, for both are alike incomprehenſible, as he hath elſewhere inform'd us. For what Cauſe did he ſend him? For that which we have told you before, namely, becauſe God the Father, being of himſelf, could not be ſent by any one; but it would not be unbecoming the Son of God, begotten of the Father, to be ſent by him. I muſt here, by way of Digreſſion, obſerve to the Reader, not much vers'd in the Writings of the Antients, that in theſe Words [the Wiſdom alſo is difficult to be contemplated] by Wiſdom is denoted the Holy Spirit. This we have before taken notice of in *Theophilus Antiochenus* and *Irenæus*. *Petavius* thus diſcourſes of the Cauſes why the Antients have uſed this way of ſpeaking: (*b*) They are therefore to be thought to call the Holy Spirit Wiſdom, becauſe the Gift of Wiſdom is diffus'd from him among Angels and Men; as the *Logos* is therefore ſaid to be ſo call'd, *becauſe it makes* them rational. Thus becauſe that excellent, and heavenly Gift of Wiſdom, as it is a Gift, and communicated to us by God, with ſingular Love and Goodneſs, is the proper Efficiency of the Holy Spirit; therefore the Fountain of Wiſdom, as of all other Gifts, is ſometimes figuratively call'd by the very Name Wiſ-

(*b*) De Trin. Lib. 7. chap. 12. n. 17.

dom.

dom. There may be other Reaſons for this Appellation, namely, becauſe the Wiſdom, which is the Gift of God, and is oppoſed to human Wiſdom, ſuch as the *Gentile* Philoſophers had, is join'd with the Love of God, and Charity, as St. *Thomas* ſays. Wherefore the Holy Spirit may as truly be call'd Wiſdom, as Love or Charity. But if you conſider Wiſdom in its Nature and Property, as it relates to the Underſtanding, and is a kind of Knowledge, the Title is peculiar to the Son and Word of God; but not to the Spirit, except extrinſecally; and, if I may ſo ſay, cauſatively. Moreover, thoſe other Words of *Origen* may deſerve our Obſervation, namely, God difficult to be contemplated,—the Word difficult to be contemplated,——ſo alſo Wiſdom difficult to be contemplated; as being exactly parallel to thoſe Words of the Creed, commonly call'd *Athanaſian*, The Father incomprehenſible, the Son incomprehenſible, and the Holy Ghoſt incomprehenſible. But to return.

12. From what has been ſaid, it is very clear, that the Doctors of the Church, who wrote before the Riſe of Arianiſm, and argue that it was not God the Father, but the Son, who appear'd under the Old Teſtament, and was in the Fulneſs of Time incarnate; that the Father is immenſe, not included in Place, and inviſible, not poſſible to be ſeen by any one; did never intend to deny that the Son of God was equally immenſe and inviſible: but only deſign'd to ſignify that all the Appearances, and the Incarnation reſpected the Oeconomy which the Son of God took upon him; which Oeconomy was by no means proper to the Father, as being of himſelf, and oblig'd to no one for his Authority. We will now ſhew, that moſt of the *Poſt-Nicene* Catholick Fathers agreed with them in this Sentiment. We have before clearly prov'd that *Euſebius* was a Catholick, by Citations from him. Now he, in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, (a Work he publiſh'd after all his other Writings, and even after the *Nicene* Council) thus proves that the

Angel worſhipp'd by *Abraham*, as God and Judge of all, was not the Father, but the Son (*c*): If it is againſt Reaſon, that the uncreate and immutable Nature of God Almighty ſhould put on the Appearance of Man; or that he ſhould deceive the Eyes of the Beholders with a Phantom, or that the Scriptures ſhould forge ſuch things; who elſe can it be ſaid that the God and Lord, who judges the whole Earth, and doth Judgment, and appear'd in a human Shape, is, (if we are not to ſay it is the firſt Cauſe of all things) but his Word only who pre-exiſted? Thus he hath alſo reaſon'd in his *Evangelical Demonſtration* (*d*). For theſe, and ſuch like Sayings, the Jeſuit *Petavius* hath made no ſcruple of calling the venerable and well-deſerving Prelate impious and profane; tho' ſurely not ignorant that *Euſebius* never intended that Senſe, which the Words at firſt ſight ſeem to exhibit; namely, That the Son of God, who formerly appear'd in a viſible Shape, was indeed of a Nature different from the Father, finite and mutable; nay, more, was actually chang'd in thoſe Appearances. For *Euſebius* hath plainly rejected that Doctrine in an hundred places; (of which *Petavius* himſelf hath cited one) yea, he *expreſly teaches* that the Word of God, after he had taken real Man into the Unity of his Perſon, remain'd God immutable, immenſe, and omnipreſent. Theſe are his Words: (*e*) *And theſe things* he did, miniſtring to the Father's Counſels, ſtill remaining immaterial, as he was before with the Father, not changing his Subſtance, not loſing his Nature, not confin'd by the Bonds of the Fleſh, nor only being there, where the human Veſſel was, and abſolutely hinder'd from being in other Places: But even then, when he liv'd among Men, he fill'd all things, he was with the Father, and in him. He then had all things in Heaven and Earth in his Care, being by no means excluded from *being every-where, as we are.* And a little after, *He was not*

(*c*) Lib. 1. chap. 2. p. 4. (*d*) Lib. 5. p. 147. (*e*) p. 537. E. H.

polluted,

polluted, when his Body was begotten; nor, being impassible, did he suffer, when it was violently separated from him. What can be more Catholick? Without doubt therefore *Eusebius* intended nothing else in the Places afore-cited (unless we would call the learned Man, as *Petavius* does, a dull Fellow) than the Fathers before him, whose Opinion we have before explain'd, namely, that the Oeconomy did not agree with God the Father, being unbegotten, either so as that he should be sent by another, or so, as that he should appear in feign'd Shapes; but that it was not unbecoming the Son of God, by the Will of the Father, of whom he was born, to undertake that Oeconomy; and for that reason, not the Father, but the Son shew'd himself formerly to the Patriarchs in the Shape of a Man; as in these last Times, not the Father, but the Son, took real and very Man into the Unity of his Person. But to proceed from *Eusebius* to the other confessedly Catholick Fathers.

13. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, (*a*) thinks that to be the Son, which *Isaiah* beheld sitting upon a Throne: No Man (says he) *hath seen the Father at any time*; he then who appear'd to the Prophet, was the Son. *Basil* (*b*) proves it was the Son who appear'd to *Moses* in the Bush, because it is written, that the Angel of the Lord appear'd in the Bush, and because that very Angel afterwards said, *I am that I am.* Hence he argues thus: *Who then* is this Angel and God? Is it not he, of whom we are inform'd, his Name is call'd the Angel of the *Great Counsel? Basil* then thought, as the Antients before-mention'd, namely, that the Name of God did equally belong to the Father and the Son; that the Name of Angel did not, being proper to the Son, who was in every Age sent by the Father, and discover'd his Will to Men. A little after, in the same place, *Basil* thus concludes: *It is then manifest* to every one, that where the same Person is call'd Angel and God, the only begotten is meant, who

(*a*) *In* Catechesi 14. (*b*) 1638. Ed. Par. p. 742.

mani-

manifeſted himſelf in the Ages to Men, and told his Saints the Will of the Father. *Theodoret* alſo proves that the Father (*a*) is inviſible, and ſhews that he neither is, nor can be ſeen. And in the fifth Queſtion upon *Exodus*, (*b*) he contends, that it was not the Father who appear'd to *Moſes* in the Buſh, and ſaid he was God; for he can't be the Meſſenger of any one: but the Son, which Son alſo is not an inferior Miniſter, or Servant.

14. Of the *Latin* Fathers, we cite theſe Evidences. *Hilary*, (*c*) an holy Man, and a very ſevere Adverſary of Arianiſm, very often and expreſly delivers the ſame Doctrine. Thus he proves the Angel, who appear'd to *Agar*, the Son of God, becauſe he is call'd both God and Lord, and the Angel of God; but both thoſe Names can't properly be given to any one but the Son of God, who alone is in his own Nature God, and in his Office and Diſpenſation the Angel of God, *i. e.* the Preacher of the Father's Will. Now this Function is not unbecoming him, as he hath his Original from the Father. For, among other things, he writes thus in the ſame place: He who is call'd the Angel of God, is alſo God and Lord; but according to the Prophet, the Son of God is the Angel of the *Great Counſel*. That the Diſtinction of Perſons might be abſolute, he is call'd the Angel of God; for he who is God of God is the Angel of God. But that he might have his due Honour, he is proclaim'd God and Lord. Hence alſo, about the end of the ſame Book, he contends, that the Son alone was ſeen by Men, but that the Father was inviſible. For upon the Place of *Jeremy*, he writes thus: You have then God ſeen upon Earth, and converſing with Men. I ask how you think theſe Words are to be underſtood: *No Man hath ſeen God at any time, but the only begotten Son, who is in the Boſom of the Father*; ſince *Jeremy*

(*a*) *In* 5. adv. Hæreſ. c. 1. (*b*) *In* Quæſt. 5. *in* Exod.
(*c*) *In* Lib. 4. de Trin.

proclaims

proclaims him God, who was ſeen upon Earth, and converſed with Men? The Father, no doubt, is not to be ſeen by any but the Son. Who then was he, who was ſeen and convers'd among Men? Certainly our God, the God viſible among Men, and handled by them. And a little after: He was ſeen upon Earth, and convers'd with Men. For there is one Mediator of God and Men, who is God and Man; and the Mediator both *under the Law*, and alſo when he took Fleſh upon him——He alone was born God of God, by whom all things in Heaven and Earth were made, by whom the Times and Ages were made. All that is, is of his making. It is he then alone who promis'd to *Abraham*, who ſpake to *Moſes*, who teſtify'd to *Iſrael*, who dwelt in the Prophets, was born by the Virgin of the Holy Spirit, *&c.* Here, by the way, it is to be obſerv'd againſt *Bellarmine*, and other Popiſh Writers, that *Hilary* expreſly affirms (what the Antients, it is plain, generally taught) that our Saviour was Mediator under the Law, and before his Incarnation; and therefore not only Mediator in reſpect of the human Nature, which he had not then aſſum'd; a thing they have eagerly contended for. Further, the *ſame Perſon*, ſpeaking of the Angel again (*a*) which appear'd to *Agar*, ſays: The Angel of God ſpeaks to *Agar*, and the ſame Angel is God. But perhaps he therefore is not true God, becauſe the Angel of God: For that ſeems to be a Name of an inferior Nature, and where the Name is of another kind, there it is thought the Subſtance is not of the ſame kind. The former Book hath indeed ſhewn the Vanity of this Queſtion; for in the Name Angel is rather the Idea of the Office than the Nature. And a little after: The Law therefore, or rather God by the Law, willing to ſignify the Perſon of the Father, call'd the Son of God the Angel of God, *i. e.* the Meſſenger of God. He in-

(*a*) *In* Lib. 5. de Trin.

timates

timates to us his Office, when he calls him Meſſenger; but the Reality of his Nature, when he calls him God. This then is the Order of the Diſpenſation, not of the Nature; for we preach no other than the Father and the Son, and we ſo equalize the Nature of the Names, as that the Nativity of the only begotten God of the unbegotten God hath the Reality or Verity of God. The Senſe of the Perſon that ſends, and the Perſon that is ſent, is no other than of Father and Son; and it does not take away the Reality of the Nature, or deſtroy the Propriety of the native Divinity in the Son. Laſtly, the ſame Perſon ſpeaks thus of the God ſeen by *Iſaiah*: For *Iſaiah* ſaw God; and though it is written, *No one hath ſeen God at any time, but the only begotten Son, who is in the Boſom of the Father, he hath declar'd him*; yet the Prophet ſaw God, and ſo beheld his Glory, as it was thought even the Dignity of a Prophet was not admitted to ſee it; for he was put to death for it by the *Jews*. The only begotten then, who is in the Boſom of the Father, hath declar'd the God, whom no one hath ſeen. And a little after, (*a*) The Prophet ſays, the Goſpel witneſſes, the Church confeſſes, that he is true God, who is ſeen; and yet no one allows that the Father is ſeen. Here he aſſerts this Doctrine, That the Father was never ſeen to any one, to be ſo Catholick in his Age, that no Catholick durſt then defend the contrary Opinion.

15. Even *Auſtin* concludes from theſe Words of *John*, (*b*) *No one hath ſeen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the Boſom of the Father, he hath declar'd him*; That the Son of God, who is the Word of God, not only brought Tidings of the Father in the laſt times, when he vouchſaf'd to appear in the Fleſh, but alſo diſcover'd him before from the Conſtitution of the World, to whom he would, either by ſpeaking, or appearing, either as ſome Angelical

(*a*) Ibid. p. 58. (*b*) *In* Lib. cont. Adim, cap. 9.

Power,

Power, or ſome other Creature. Which Concluſion is of no force, unleſs it be taken for granted, that the Senſe of the Evangeliſt's Words are, that God the Father himſelf never ſhew'd himſelf to any one. Therefore *Auſtin* contradicts himſelf, as he often does, and ſays that, which *Hilary* affirms, he thought no Catholick durſt ſay, when in *another place* he ſpeaks thus: (*a*) That it is too raſh to ſay, that God the Father never appear'd in any viſible Shapes to the Fathers or Prophets. This Saying of *Auſtin*'s, *Petavius* raſhly approves as certain. Under the New Teſtament indeed we know that God the Father hath ſpoke to Men, as in the Baptiſm of Chriſt, and at his Tranſfiguration, ſaying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed*; and in that Voice, *I have both glorify'd, and will again glorify.* From theſe Places of Scripture, *Petavius*, deſirous to prove *Auſtin*'s Aſſertion, namely, that God the Father had ſometime appear'd to the Prophets, argues thus: For it is not more unworthy that ſupreme and moſt excellent Majeſty of God, to make himſelf after ſome ſort heard by Men, by ſome ſenſible Means, than to make himſelf viſible to them by the temporary Uſe of ſome corporeal Shape. Here muſt be a falſe Print; *It is not more unworthy:* The Jeſuit, I ſuppoſe, wrote, or ſhould have wrote, *It is not more worthy*; otherwiſe the Reaſoning is very looſe. But I ſay, that is not ſo certain, as *Petavius* thought; for according to the Opinion of the Antients, as I have often ſaid, thoſe Appearances of God in ſome viſible corporeal Shape, were Preludes and Figures of the future Incarnation, which did no way agree to the Father. But grant it certain, the Places cited are impertinent; for *Auſtin*, whoſe Defence *Petavius* undertakes, hath expreſly ſpoken of the Appearances of God formerly made to the Fathers, and the Prophets under the Old Teſtament. Beſides it was extraordinary, and alſo neceſſary to

(*a*) *In* Lib 2. de Trin. chap. 17.

confirm

confirm the Miſſion of the Son from the Father, who appear'd now upon Earth as a mere Man, that the Father ſhould pronounce ſuch words of his Son: But this by the way. Further, whereas thoſe Appearances of God under the Old Teſtament regarded the Miſſion of the one by the other, and the Function committed by one to the other, upon which account generally he that appeared, was not only called God, but alſo Angel, that is, ſent; *Auſtin* himſelf plainly confeſſes that Miſſion does not agree to God the Father. For in the fourth Book of the Trinity he writes thus: *(a)* As therefore the Father begat, and the Son is begotten; ſo the Father ſent, and the Son is ſent. Again, As to be begotten, is to the Son the ſame as to exiſt from the Father; ſo to be ſent, is to the Son the ſame as to be known to be of, or from him. And in the end of the ſame fourth Book he aſſerts it very abſurd to ſay, that the Father is ſent by the Son whom he begat, or by the Holy Spirit, who proceeded from him; tho he is pleaſed viſibly to appear by a Creature ſubject to him. But he ſpeaks the moſt clearly *in theſe Words:* *(b)* The Father alone is not ſaid to be ſent, becauſe he hath no Author, of whom he was begotten, or from whom he proceeds. And the Father is therefore not ſaid to be ſent, not becauſe of a diverſity of Nature, for there is no ſuch thing in the Trinity; but becauſe of his Authority. For the Splendor or Heat ſends not the Fire, but the Fire ſends the Splendor or Heat. *(c)* To which you have this parallel place: For it was fit, not that the Father ſhould be ſent by the Son; but the Son by the Father. Now this is not an Inequality of Subſtance, but an Order of Nature; not that the one is prior to the other, but that the one is of the other. But as to the Appearances under the Old Teſtament, thus far we agree with *Auſtin*, whom *Petavius* follows, that God was not alway in the Angel by a ſpecial Preſence; but admini-

(*a*) Cap. 20. (*b*) In Lib. contra Arian. Serm. c. 4. (*c*) Lib. 3. contra Maximin. Arian. c. 14.

ſtred

ſtred many Affairs by Angels only; nay, we deny not, that ſome Antients have gone too far in this Queſtion. Further we freely confeſs, that it is often difficult to conjecture when a mere Angel, and when God in an Angel appear'd; and with *Petavius* embrace the Rule of *Alphonſus Toſtatus*, as a good one; namely, that there are ſome things recorded in Scripture which are ſmall, and belong but to ſome one, or a few; others, which are extraordinary, remarkable, and of univerſal concern. In the former, Angels alone are the Miniſters, which the Scripture ſo expreſſes, as not to give any hint of a divine Perſon. The latter are tranſacted by God, and ſo declared, as that it appears, not only that an Angel was preſent, but that God acted and ſpoke by him what he pleaſed. But ſtill we think this the moſt certain Token of the Divine Preſence, when he who appears or ſpeaks, openly profeſſes himſelf to be God, or he that is, or the God of *Abraham*, &c. or the God of the Fathers; and requires Divine Worſhip and Adoration to be paid him: This we know was done by him, who ſpoke to *Moſes* in the Buſh, and to the *Iſraelites* in *Mount Sinai*. In the mean time, we conſtantly affirm, that whereſoever it is plain God appeared, there is to be underſtood not the Father, but the Son; and herein we Religiouſly follow the conſentient Judgment of primitive Antiquity. But to return.

16. Beſides the Evidence we have brought, *Petavius* himſelf has help'd us to ſome. *Prudentius* very fully proves againſt the *Patripaſſians*, that the Word only appeared to the Antients, not in its proper ſhape, but a corporeal one, and that becauſe the Father could not be ſeen of any one. Thus amongſt other things he writes, (*a*) Was God paſſible, whoſe ſhape and figure was never ſeen by any one? That Majeſty is not eaſy to be comprehended by Senſe, the Eyes, or Hand. We have the famous Teſtimony of the great *John*,

(*a*) *Prudentius* in initio Apoth. Ed. Amſterd. Janſ. p. 153.

that

that God could never be seen. *Again*, (*b*) Whosoever is reported to have seen God, hath seen his Son: For the Son is that, which shining forth from the Father, makes himself visible by shapes, which human Sight can comprehend. Then he says that the Word only was seen under a corporeal shape by *Abraham* and *Moses*; not by any means the Father: (*c*) Believe me, no one hath seen God, no one, believe me. God of the Fountain God is visible; God the Fountain himself is not. He who is begotten may be seen, not he who is unbegotten, *&c.*

Cassian says, (*d*) This is he only, who spake to the Patriarchs, dwelt in the Prophets, was conceived of the Spirit, born of the Virgin *Mary*, &c. *Then*, For was the Father ever seen upon Earth, who is never said to be visible but to the Son? Was he brought forth in the Flesh, or did he converse among Men? No sure. Lastly, *Isidore* (*e*) says: For it is the very Son, who being always sent by the Father, appeared visibly to Men. From his Mission therefore he is rightly called the *Angel.* (*f*)

17. I'll only add one thing more as worthy observation, That antiently the Symbols of some Churches, did by way of distinction profess God the Father invisible, and impassible, namely in the Sense explain'd. *Rufinus* indeed, in his Explication of the Creed commonly called the Apostles, expressly witnesseth, that the Creed of *Aquileia* in the Article concerning the Father had in his time after [Almighty] Invisible and Impassible. Whence also in the Epistle of *Auxentius*, Arch-bishop of *Milan*, in *Hilary*, the first Article of the Creed is even now read thus: I believe in God the Father Almighty, Invisible, Impassible, Immortal. *Erasmus*, in his Answer to the Censure of the *Paris* Divines says, that the Eastern Churches had also received

(*b*) Ibid. (*c*) p. 155. (*d*) In Lib. 4. de Incarnatione, c. 9. (*e*) De Natura Domini, cap. 1. (*f*) *Whosoever desires more upon this Head, may consult* Petav. de Trin. Lib. 8. cap. 2.

the

the ſame Addition; which (*a*) *Voſſius* too thought probable. But without doubt this Addition was oppoſed to a Hereſy, which ſome (*b*) whoſe Names are loſt, did firſt defend, and then *Praxeas*, afterwards *Beryllus*, and *Noetus*, and laſtly *Sabellius*; all holding, that not the Son of God, but God the Father himſelf, was ſeen by Men under the Old Teſtament, and in the Fulneſs of Time was incarnate and ſuffered.

Dr. Grabe's *Annotation upon Ch.* 3. *S.* 5. &c.

I only add this to the Reverend Author's Diſcourſe upon *Juſtin Martyr*, that if the Adverſaries will therefore conclude that *Juſtin* deny'd the Immenſity and Omnipreſence of God the Son, becauſe he hath ſaid that he appeared in a ſmall part of the Earth, as tho he had left the Heavens; they may as well conclude, that *Juſtin* deny'd the Immenſity and Omnipreſence of God the Father, becauſe he ſeems to confine him, as it were, to the Regions above. For *he ſays* (*c*) that God the Father always abides in the higheſt Heavens. And (*d*) he abides in his own Region, whatſoever that is, ſeeing and hearing quickly. But as God the Father is ſaid to be in Heaven, becauſe the Angels in Heaven behold his Face, *Matt.* 18. 10; ſo the Word is ſaid to be on Earth, becauſe on Earth he appeared in a viſible ſhape to the Patriarchs, and other holy Men: Tho both of them do equally fill Heaven and Earth, *Jerem.* 23. 24. Beſides, there is a remarkable Place to be added to the Citations from *Irenæus* for the Inviſibility and Incomprehenſibility of the Son of God. *It is this:* (*e*) *He then took Man upon himſelf*, inviſible became viſible, incomprehenſible comprehenſible, impaſſible paſſible, and the Word Man, *ſumming up*, or gathering together all things into himſelf; that as the Word of God is chief in Super-celeſtial, Spiritual and Inviſible things; ſo he might have the Principality in

(*a*) De Tribus Symb. p. 26. (*b*) *Juſtin* Apol. 2. p. 96. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 358. (*c*) p. 275. (*d*) p. 357. (*e*) p. 277.

visible and corporeal things, taking the Primacy upon himself, and placing himself Head of the Church, that in due time he may draw all things to himself. See *Clement* of *Alexand.* Strom. 7. I add nothing concerning the other Fathers, for brevity's sake.

CHAP. IV.

The Third Thesis is proposed, in which the Use of the Doctrine of the Son's Subordination is explained.

THO I have so largely explained the Sentiment of the Antients concerning the Subordination of the Son to the Father; it still remains that I say something concerning the excellent Use the Antients observed in this Doctrine. This then shall be the third Thesis, and the last of this last Section.

THESIS III.

The Antient Doctors thought this Doctrine of the Subordination of the Son to the Father, as his Original and Principle, very useful and absolutely necessary to be known and believed; because by this especially the Divinity of the Son may be asserted, and the Unity of the Divine Monarchy preserved notwithstanding. For tho the Name and Nature be common to two, namely to the Father and his Son, yet because the one is the Principle of the other, from which he is propagated, and that by an interior not an external Production, God is truly said to be only One. This Reason those Antients did also believe equally to belong to the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

2. According to the Opinion of the Antients, which is also the Voice of Common Sense, if there were two unbe-

unbegotten, or independent Principles in the Divinity, the Conſequence would be, that not only the Father would be deprived of his Pre-eminence, being of and from himſelf alone (of which we have largely treated before) but alſo that there would neceſſarily be two Gods. On the other hand, ſuppoſing the Subordination, by which the Father alone is God of himſelf, and the Son God of God, the Doctors have thought both the Father's Pre-eminence, and the Divine Monarchy ſafe. This they would have extended to the Holy Spirit alſo, the third Perſon of the Deity, whom, as having his Original from the Father by the Son, they believed in no wiſe to bring in Tritheiſm. There are many things well worth reading to be found in the Fathers upon this head, eſpecially in thoſe, who have wrote more largely concerning the Trinity. We will give you a few ſelect Paſſages out of the great Quantity.

3. We have before heard *Athenagoras* (*a*) inſer that there is but one God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, becauſe there is but one Fountain of the Divinity, namely the Father, from whom both the Son and Holy Spirit have their Original. *Tertullian* (*b*) hath very fully explained the Matter, *where* he thus learnedly argues againſt the *Praxeans*, who under the Pretence of aſſerting one God, denied the Diſtinction of Perſons: We muſt always review what we have treated of, leſt we ſeem to have condemn'd every thing that is wrong without examination, and by prejudice; eſpecially this, which thinks itſelf in poſſeſſion of the very Truth, ſuppoſing that we cannot otherwiſe believe one God, than by ſaying that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are the very ſame; as tho all were not alſo thus one, as being all of one, namely by Unity of Subſtance, and the Myſtery of the Œconomy was preſerved notwithſtanding, which makes the One three. Some time after he proceeds thus: They publiſh that we preach two or three Gods, and preſume, that them-

(*a*) See Sect. 2. Ch. 4. n. 9. (*b*) Tert. p. 501, 502.

ſelves are the Worſhippers of the one God; as tho a miſtaken Unity is not heretical, and a right Trinity is not the Truth. They ſay we hold the Monarchy: The *Latins*, even thoſe of them that are barbarous, ſo expreſs the Sound, that you would think they as well underſtood the Word *Monarchia*, as pronounced it. Now the *Latins* ſtudy to ſpeak *Monarchia*; even the *Greeks* will not underſtand the Diſpenſation. But if I have got any knowledge of the two Languages, I know that Monarchy ſignifies nothing but the Government of One; but yet that it hath not that Title, becauſe of one, of him whoſe it is, or that he hath not a Son, or that he made himſelf a Son to himſelf, or doth not adminiſter his Monarchy by whom he pleaſes. Now I ſay, that no Government is to the Government of one himſelf ſo ſingular to a Monarchy, as that it is not adminiſter'd by others, whom he makes his Officials. If he has a Son, who has a Monarchy, that the Monarchy is not neceſſarily divided, and ceaſes to be a Monarchy, if he takes his Son in Collegue; that it is principally his therefore, from whom it was communicated to the Son; and as his, is therefore a Monarchy, which is jointly held by two ſo much one. If then the Divine Monarchy is adminiſtred by ſo many Legions and Hoſts of Angels, as it is written, *A thouſand Millions ſtood by him, and an hundred Thouſand appeared before him*; and yet it ceaſes not to be the Government of one, a Monarchy, tho adminiſter'd by ſo many thouſand Powers: how is it that God ſeems to be divided and diſperſed in the Son and Holy Spirit, ſo Partakers of the Father's Subſtance; and yet is not divided and diſperſed in ſuch a Number of Angels ſo different from the Father's Subſtance? Thou falſly thinkeſt the Members, Pledges, Inſtruments, Powers, and the whole Parade of Monarchy to be the deſtruction of it. I would have thee uſe thyſelf to the Senſe of the Thing, not the Sound of the Word. This thou art to underſtand to be the overthrowing the Monarchy, when another Government

vernment of its own proper frame and ſtate, is by this introduc'd as a Rival of it; when another God is advanced in oppoſition to the Creator. Then it is evil, when we ſet up more, as *Prodicus* and *Valentinus* did; then we ruin the Monarchy, when we pull down the Creator. Now when I don't derive the Son from any thing elſe, but the Subſtance of the Father, and repreſent him as doing nothing without the Father's Will, and as having obtain'd all his Power from the Father; how can I indeed deſtroy the Monarchy, which I preſerve in the Son, being delivered to him by the Father? I may urge this alſo in the third Perſon, for as much as I think the Spirit to have proceeded no other way than from the Father by the Son. Take care then, leſt thou rather deſtroyeſt the Monarchy, who overturneſt the Diſpenſation and Diſpoſition of it in ſo many Perſons as God pleaſed. Hitherto *Tertullian* very Learnedly.

4. The like we have in *Novatian*, where he thus writes concerning God the Father and the Son: (*a*) Namely, God proceeding from God, making a ſecond Perſon, but not depriving the Father of being the One God. For if he had not been born, the unborn compared with the unborn, an Equality appearing, would have made two Unborns, and therefore two Gods. If he had been unbegotten, compared with the unbegotten, and found equal, the unbegottens would have truly made two Gods, and therefore Chriſt would have made two Gods. If he had been found without Original, as the Father, and had himſelf been the Principle of all things, as the Father, making two Principles, he had conſequently made us two Gods. Then a little after he adds: But now whatſoever he is, he is not of himſelf, becauſe not unborn; but of the Father, becauſe begotten. Whether therefore he is the Word, or the Power, or the Wiſdom, or the Light, or the Son, or whatſoever of theſe, ſince he is of no other, as I ſaid before, but the Father, owing his O-

(*a*) P. 729, *and* 730.

riginal to his Father, he cannot divide the Divinity into two Gods, who had his Original by being born of the One God. Upon account of which, being the only begotten and the first begotten of him, who hath no beginning, he alone is the Principle and Head of all things. Lastly, towards the end he thus discourses: The Son is shewn to be God, to whom the Divinity is seen to be reach'd out and deliver'd; * but yet the Father is proved to be the One God, *because of that Reciprocation of the Divinity and Majesty of the Son to the Father, who gave it.*

5. We have elsewhere cited *Hippolytus*, thus discoursing in his Book against *Noetus*: When I say the Son is different from the Father, I do not say, that there are two Gods; but as it were, Light from Light, Water from the Fountain, and a Ray from the Sun. For there is one Power from the Whole, the Father is the Whole, from which this Power, the Word.

* *The Answer to the Queries interpolates this Place, as also Dr.* Clarke, *by adding the Words* [*by acknowledgment.*] *Not content with this, they have thought fit to leave out these Words* [Unus Deus ostenditur verus & æternus Pater, à quo solo hæc vis Divinitatis emissa, etiam in Filium tradita & directa, rursum per Substantiæ communionem ad Patrem revolvitur] *by which* Sect. 2. Ch. 8. n. 5. *not only the Sense and Meaning, but also the Sum and Substance of what preceded, is strangely mangled. It is said besides, that these Words* [Cujus sic Divinitas traditur, ut non aut dissonantia aut inæqualitate Divinitatis duos Deos reddidisse videatur] *are corrupt, and Dr.* Clarke *lamely attempts the emendation of them: but really they stand in no need of it, unless they must be forced into the Doctor's Scheme.— Answer to the Queries* p. 36, *and* 37. *Against Mr.* Nelson's *Friend*, p. 138, 139. *Surely* [aut dissonantia aut in æqualitate] *consider'd in Syntax is such Latin as never even* Africa *produced. The Sense of the Place is pretended to be the best understood from the consideration of what goes before: But every ordinary Reader will quickly see, that* Novatian *intends to give the Reason of that Sentence in what follows it. He uses the Particle* [enim] *to introduce it, and plainly means, that the Divinity of the Son does not jar with that of the Father, because the Subjection of every thing to the Son is from the Authority of the Father; that the Divinity of the Son is not unequal to that of the Father, because their Nature is common and reciprocal; so that they are not two either in the Exercise of Authority, or the Inequality, or Separation of Existence.*

Here

Here I have obſerved, that the Father and Son are therefore proved, tho diſtinct in Perſon, to be one God, becauſe the Son is not God of himſelf, but God of God, even of the Father, as Light proceeds from Light, Water from the Fountain, and Ray from the Sun. Laſtly, to omit many others, whom I might cite, *Origen* makes this Note upon Ch. 9. v. 5. of the Epiſtle to the *Romans:* Chriſt then is of them, as concerning the Fleſh, who is over all God Bleſſed for ever. That Chriſt is one according to the Fleſh, and another according to the Spirit, he ſignified in the former Parts of this Epiſtle, where he ſaith: Who was made of the Seed of *David* according to the Fleſh who was the *Predeſtinated* Son of God in Power according to the *Sanctification of the Spirit.* How he is according to the Spirit the Son of God, and according to the Fleſh the Son of *David,* we have more fully explain'd before. He then, whom he there calls the Son of God according to the Spirit, is here in the following part of his Doctrine, his Auditors having made a proficiency, called God over all Bleſſed for ever. I wonder how thoſe that read what the ſame Apoſtle ſays in other Words, *There is one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things;* deny that they are obliged to profeſs the Son of God to be God, leſt they ſeem to ſay there are two Gods. What will they make of this place alſo, in which Chriſt is plainly ſtyl'd God over all? But they mind not, who are of this Opinion, that as he called the Lord Jeſus Chriſt not ſo one Lord, as that God the Father is not alſo called Lord; ſo he called not God the Father, ſo one God, as that the Son may not alſo be thought God. For the Scripture is true, which ſays, *Know ye that the Lord is God.* Now both are one God; becauſe the Son hath no other beginning of his Divinity than the Father; but the Son (as Wiſdom ſaith) is the moſt pure Emanation of the very one Paternal Fountain. I know (*a*) *Eraſmus* hath pre-

(*a*) *Eraſmus* in locum.

tended (the better to defend his own abſurd Interpretation of that remarkable Paſſage of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 9. v. 5.) that this Paragraph was corrected by *Jerom*, or ſome other of *Origen*'s Interpreters, and hath endeavour'd to prove it, becauſe it was ſtrange *Origen* ſhould here tell us, that there were Men then, who durſt not call Chriſt God, leſt they ſhould ſeem to make two Gods: but why is that ſo ſtrange? Becauſe the Doctrine of the *Arians* is here noted, which (as *Eraſmus* afterwards explains himſelf) was not condemn'd till many Years after *Origen*. But who would not wonder that the great *Eraſmus* ſhould either not know, or not remember, that there were many, not only in *Origen*'s time, but many Years before, who were afraid to acknowledge Chriſt to be a Divine Perſon diſtinct from the Father, leſt they ſhould ſeem to make two Gods. Did not the *Praxeans* before *Origen*, deny that God the Father had a Son Perſonally diſtinct from him, and of the ſame Nature with him, under pretence of the Monarchy? Did not *Noetus*, *Origen*'s Contemporary, defend the ſame Hereſy? Hath not *Beryllus* taught it, with whom *Origen* diſputed in a Synod of Biſhops? There were others beſides, in the Days of *Origen* and before, who univerſally and abſolutely deny'd the diſtinct Subſiſtence of the Son in the Divine Eſſence, and even his Divinity, leſt they ſhould make two Gods? Did the very learned Man never hear of the *Ebionites*, (*a*) who profeſſing themſelves Worſhippers of the One God the Father, affirm'd that Chriſt was a mere Man? And who are in more places than one by name taken notice of by *Origen*? Did not *Theodotus Coriarius* teach this Doctrine long before *Origen*? Laſtly, (*b*) That you may not think the Text cited to be interpolated by *Jerom*, or ſome other Interpreter, *ſee the ſame* Origen in the Commentary upon *John* publiſh'd in *Greek* by *Huetius*, en-

(*a*) In Libris contra Celſum. (*b*) *Conſult the Judgment of the Catholick Church concerning all the Hereticks hitherto mentioned, who deny our Lord's Divinity.*

gaging

gaging the same Heresy with the same Weapons (*a*). Further, the same *Origen* in his first Book upon *Genesis*, after he had said, that the Son was the eternal Splendor of the eternal Light, subjoins; He existed, but not so as we have said of the eternal Light, lest we should seem to bring in two Principles of Light; but as the Splendor of the unbegotten Light, having that Light his Beginning, and Original. Lastly, in his undoubted Work against *Celsus* (*b*) he contends, that the Christians are not guilty of Sedition against God the Father of all Things, tho they adore the Son with Divine Worship, as well as the Father; and he proves it by this Argument, because all the Honour of the Son redounds to God the Father. The Words are: Now *Celsus* cannot shew that we are guilty of any Sedition concerning the Son. For we even worship the Father, when we admire his Son, the Word, and Wisdom, and Truth, and Righteousness, and whatsoever we have heard the Son of God is, so begotten of such a Father.

6. Now lest any one should reckon these among the dangerous Sayings of the Primitive Fathers, I add, that the *Post-Nicene* Fathers who kept closest to the Decrees of that Council, taught the same Doctrine. The great *Athanasius*, the most rigid Defender of the *Nicene Faith*, is ample Evidence of this Matter. Thus he speaks in his Oration against the *Sabellians*: (*c*) Where there is but one Principle, and one Begotten of it, the exact and natural Image, because begotten of him, there is one God; the Divinity being conceiv'd perfect in the Father, and the Father's Divinity subsisting perfect in the Son. *But he* is more full in his fourth Oration (*d*) against the *Arians*: Since Christ is God of God, and the Word, Wisdom, Son and Power of God; therefore we are told there is one God in Holy Scripture. For the Word being the Son of the One God, is refer'd to him, whose he is. So that there are two, the Father and Son, but still an indissolved, un-

(*a*) C. 1. n. 10. *of this Section.* (*b*) P. 386, 387. (*c*) Tom. 2. p. 43. (*d*) Vol. 1. Tom. 1. p. 617.

divided

divided Unity of the Godhead. Thus we must say one Principle of the Godhead, not two. Hence properly comes the Monarchy. Of this Principle the Word is the Son, not as another Principle subsisting of himself, nor begotten extrinsecally of the same, lest by the diversity there should be a double, or manifold Principality. But the one Principle hath its proper Son, Wisdom, and Word, subsisting from or of him. This is very clear.

7. *Basil* defends the Unity (*a*) of God after the same manner. There are not two Gods, nor two Fathers. He that introduces two Principles, preaches up two Gods. *Gregory* (*b*) *Nazianzen* elegantly calls the Father the Union, because (which *Petavius* well observes) the Production, the Procession of one Person from another, or the Unity of Principle is the Cause of the Unity in the Trinity. The three, *says he*, have one Nature, that of God. The Father is the Union, or Unity, of whom, and to whom those that follow, are refer'd. *Again*, (*c*) The One God, as I think, would be preserv'd, if the Son and Holy Spirit are refer'd to one Cause, without composition or confusion. *Cæsarius* says, that *Moses* wrote, (*d*) *The Lord thy God is one Lord;* that he might exalt us to the Unity of Principle, and Knowledge of God. Which one Principle is the Father, from whom the Son and Holy Spirit proceed. *Damascene* says, (*e*) Neither do we affirm, that there are three Gods, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; but rather one God, the Sacred Trinity, the Son and Spirit being brought back to the one Principle, not mix'd, or confounded, as *Sabellius* taught. Where it is plain, *Damascene* hath made use of *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Expression. Of the *Latins* I'll only give you an Author or two. *Hilary* (*f*) says: The Father does not therefore cease to be the One God, because the Son is God. For he is God of God, One of One;

(*a*) Orat. 27. contra Sabellianos. (*b*) Orat. 32. p. 520. (*c*) Orat. 29. p. 490. (*d*) In Dialog. 1. ad Int. 4. (*e*) In Lib. 1. de Orthod. fide, c. 2. (*f*) In 4 Lib. de Trin. p. 37.

who

who is therefore the One God, becauſe God of himſelf; on the other hand, the Son is not leſs God, becauſe the Father is the One God. For he is the only begotten Son of God, not unbegotten ſo as to take from the Father his being the One God; nor yet himſelf being any thing elſe but God, becauſe begotten of him. Thus *Fulgentius* (*a*) alſo anſwers an *Arian* Objection: In two unbegotten there is a different Divinity, but in one begotten of one unbegotten is plainly a natural Unity.

8. Now concerning this Method of the Antient Catholicks, by which they prove the Unity of God, there are two things eſpecially obſervable. Firſt, that the *Arians* alſo did in Words embrace it. For the Biſhops of the *Arian* Faction in the Council of *Sirmium*, when in the beginning of their Creed they had profeſſed to believe with the *Nicene Fathers*, that the Son of God was God of God, Light of Light, at the end they define thus: If any one ſay that the Son is unbegotten, without Beginning or Principle, as ſaying, that there are two without Beginning or Principle, two unbegotten, and as making two Gods, let him be *Anathema*. For the Son is the Head and Principle of all things; but God is the Head of Chriſt. For thus we piouſly reduce all things thro the Son to the one Principle of all things without beginning. But theſe Words, it is certain, were not ſincerely, but after their Sophiſtical manner ſpoke by them. For the *Arians* believ'd, that the Son of God was produced of God the Father, as of a Principle, in a created way, as all other things are; and made this only difference between the Son of God, and the other Creatures; that the Son was firſt and immediately produced out of nothing by the Father; and then all other things by the Son. This the *Sirmians* plainly ſignify in theſe Words: We piouſly refer all things to the One Principle by the Son. Here they ſufficiently ſhew that they equally refer the Son and

(*a*) In Lib. cont. Obj. Arian. *Obj.* 5. (*b*) *Socrates.* Lib. 2. Ch. 30. p. 103.

all

all other things to the Father as a Principle; the Son indeed immediately; and the other things by the Son. But it is vain and very ridiculous for any one to attempt to prove that the Father and Son are one God, becauſe the one exiſts from the other as his Principle, unleſs by Principle he means a Conſubſtantial Principle. For unleſs this be ſuppoſed, it will alſo follow (which is very abſurd) that every created thing is one God with the Father; for every Creature hath in ſome ſort his Original from God the Father, as from a Principle. A notable God of God the *Arians* have, who is no otherwiſe of God than by way of Creation, as all other created things are! You'll ſay, that theſe things don't affect the *Semi-Arians* however, who determine that the Son of God is produced of God the Father, not of Nothing; and yet abſolutely deny that he was begotten of the Subſtance of the Father. I own there were ſuch Men formerly, and I have explain'd their Sentiment above: But I always thought them very weak Creatures. For, (*a*) as before the Creation there was no medium between the Subſtance of God and Nothing, ſo there could be no middle Production between a Production of the Subſtance of God, and a Production of Nothing. The *Semi-Arian* therefore, and the *Semi-God*, and the *Semi-Creature*, are equally Monſters, and Prodigies, truly to be dreaded by all pious and ſound Minds. The Son of God muſt either be true God, or a mere Creature. It is an Axiom of Eternal Truth, that there is nothing between God and Creature, unmade and made. Therefore the Catholick Fathers had a much better right to uſe this Argument, as all of them unanimouſly aſſerting the Son's Conſubſtantiality.

9. The other thing, which I propoſe to the Reader's Obſervation, is, That this Reaſoning taken from the Unity of Principle, tho the Principle be ſuppoſed Conſubſtantial, is not, univerſally and abſolutely conſider'd,

(*a*) Sect. 2. Ch. 9. n. 11.

fit

fit and accommodate, to clear up and prove the Unity of the Father and Son. For it hath, as *Petavius* hath rightly caution'd, a general Power of concluding in all things, especially Vital and Animal, in which we see this Generation, properly speaking. But these, tho of the same Nature with their Principle, make many separate and distinct Individuals. Therefore I purposely added in the Thesis, that the Father is the Principle of the Son and Holy Spirit, and that both of them are propagated from him by an interior Production, not an external one. Hence it comes to pass, that they are not only of the Father, but in him, and the Father in them, and that there can't be one Person separate from another in the Holy Trinity, as three humane Persons, or three other Subjects of the same Species are separate. Those that think so of the Divine Persons, well deserve to be called *Tritheists*, of whom *Hieronymus Zanchius* (*a*) learnedly writes thus: This is their Comment, who have also dream'd, that the Son is so born of the Father, as to be without or extrinsic of his Essence, as our Children are. For they can't perceive, how any thing can be born of any thing, and be his Son, and yet remain in him, of whom he is born. This is so, because they believe all Generation is exterior, not any interior. I say the same concerning the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Now they have come to these Conclusions, because contemplating the Divine Essence in their finite Mind, they cou'd not raise to themselves any other than a finite Idea; nor cou'd otherwise distinguish the Persons from one another, than by separating the *Essence of one from the Essence of another*. When the *Sabellians* objected this same Error to the Catholicks, who said that the Son did as well subsist by himself as the Father, the Eastern Bishops assembled at *Antioch* A. D. 345. in their Confession of Faith called *Macrostichus*, did no less Catholickly than Elegantly answer

(*a*) De tribus Elohim, Lib. 5. C. 1. n. 2.

thus:

thus: (I venture to say so, tho not a few of those Bishops were found in the Interest of *Arianism*, and the Word *Consubstantialis* omitted in the Confession.) (*a*) But though we say that the Son exists by himself, lives and subsists as the Father doth, we don't therefore separate him from the Father, conceiving in a bodily manner, certain places and intervals, by which they are joined. For we believe, that they are joined without any Medium, or Interstice, and that they subsist inseparably from one another; The whole Father having the Son in his Bosom, the whole Son dependent upon, and coherent to the Father, and only always resting in his Bosom. It would be strange, that the *Arians* at that Council subscribed these Words, if there were not also other things in that Creed, diametrically opposite to *Arianism*, which they also confirmed by their Subscription. Such is that especially, that the Son of God is true and perfect God by Nature: But those dark Fellows were ready to approve any Creed, which had not the *Homoousion*; tho it had other Terms in it, altogether of the same import. To return, the Father and Son then are so one, that the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son: neither can the one be separated from the other. This manner of Union the *Greeks* call Περιχώρησις. The *Latins* (the School-men I mean,) *Circuminceſſio* or *Circumin-ſeſſio*. *Genebrard* (*b*) among others thus explains the Word: Περιχώρησις and *Circuminceſſio* may be said to be that Union, by which one thing exists in another, not only by a Participation of Nature, but also by a full and intimate Presence. This kind of existing in, if I may so say, our Divines call Circuminceſſion, because by it some things are very much distinguish'd from one another without separation; are in, and as it were penetrate one another, without confusion.

(*a*) *Socrates*, Lib. 2. Chap. 19. pag. 83. (*b*) Lib. 2. de Trin.

10. I will now shew, that the Antients generally acknowledg'd such an Union as this in the Divine Persons, and first I shall begin with the the *Ante-Nicene* Doctors. Now here I would desire my Reader to recur to that Treasure of Testimonies produc'd in the former Sections. There he will find places cited from the respective Fathers, which teach either, that the Son of God subsists in God, or remains in the Bosom of God, or that the Word is implanted in his Heart; and in like manner, that the Father is in the Son, all which Expressions plainly signify the Union, of which we treat. But this Notion is so clearly expressed in almost all the Writings of the Antients, and so repugnant to the *Arian* Hypothesis, that I have often wonder'd, that wise and well-read Men in the Antiquities of the Church, could seriously accuse those Writers of *Arianism*. Indeed they might with much greater probability have charg'd them with *Sabellianism*, tho that Calumny also is easily to be repelled, as I have elsewhere shewn. To the same Purpose is that, which the same Antients with one Voice profess, that the Son is begotten of the Father without any Section or Division, and so brought forth of the Father, as not to be separated from him. Thus *Justin*, *Tatian*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Tertullian*, *Novatian*, yea all of them. Hence *Tertullian*: (*a*) This is the Preserver of Unity, by which we say (namely all the Catholicks in the Article of the Trinity) that the Son was brought forth of the Father, not separated from him. What can be more clear than that place of *Athenagoras*, *cited before?* (*b*) There the very learned Writer, after he had said, that the Father and Son were one, declares the manner of their Union thus: The Father being in the Son, and the Son in the Father by the Unity and Power of the Spirit. Parallel to this, is *Clement* of *Alexandria* in the same Section (*c*). *Tertullian* as plainly and succinctly expresses the same, (*d*) where he says that the Holy

(*a*) Adv. Prax. Ch. 8. (*b*) Sect. 2. Ch. 4. n. 8. (*c*) Ch. 6. n. 4. (*d*) Adv. Prax. Ch. 12.

Trinity

Trinity is one Subſtance in three Coherents; not then diverſe Subſtances in three mutually ſeparate. (*a*) The ſame *Tertullian* ſays, The Connexion of the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Paraclete, make three Coherents, which three are one Thing, not *one Perſon*. *Again*, (*b*) The Trinity paſſing down from the Father thro joint and connected degrees, is not repugnant to the Monarchy. *Laſtly*, He ſays, that (*c*) in the Trinity there is Number without Diviſion. That is alſo a very clear Paſſage of *Origen*, which we *cited before*, (*d*) where he profeſſedly oppoſes their Error, who cut the Divine Nature into Parts, and as much as lies in them divide God the Father. For, *ſays he*, even to ſuſpect ſuch things of an incorporeal Nature, is not only the utmoſt Impiety, but the groſſeſt Folly; nor indeed is it agreeable to Reaſon at all, to have an Idea of a ſubſtantial or material Diviſion in an incorporeal Nature. Now we ſhould rather think, as the Will proceeds from the Mind, and does not take away or cut off any part of the Mind, or is ſeparated or divided from it, ſo the Father *begat the Son*. The ſame *Origen*, in that undoubted Piece of his againſt *Celſus*, often teaches, that the Divine Nature and Eſſence is common to the Son with the Father, as hath been abundantly ſhewn above; and yet in the fourth Book of the ſame Work, he aſſerts expreſly, that the Nature of God is incorruptible, ſimple, uncompounded and indiviſible. There alſo he adds, that the Son of God ſubſiſts in the Form or Nature of God, and therefore hath the ſame Attributes. A little after, he calls the Son of God, God the Word in the Father. Surely whoever duly conſiders that remarkable Paſſage of *Origen*, will find in it, that the two Perſons, Father and Son, ſubſiſt undivided in the ſame Eſſence (*e*). See alſo the famous Teſtimony of *Dionyſius Rom.* to the ſame purpoſe (*f*). There the great Man ſharply cenſures thoſe, who

(*a*) Ibid. Ch. 25. (*b*) Ch. 8. (*c*) Ch. 2. (*d*) Ch. 9. n. 19. Sect. 2. (*e*) Sect. 2. Ch. 9. n. 14. (*f*) Ch. 11. n. 1.

divide

divide, split, and overturn the Sacred Doctrine of God's Church, parting the Principle of Unity into three certain Powers, three divided Persons, three Deities. To their Heresy he quickly after opposes the Catholick Doctrine thus: For it is necessary the Word of God be united to the God of all, and that the Holy Spirit abide and dwell in God; and it is absolutely necessary that the Divine Trinity be gather'd together, and united into one, as a certain Head, or Sum, I say, into the Almighty God of all things. These Words of *Dionysius* greatly confirm the Definition of the περιχώρησις, which the learned *Bellarmine* hath embraced, (*a*) when he says it is that intimate and perfect Inhabitation of one Person in another. Lastly, not to be too long upon so plain a Case, you may find in the same place, a Passage of *Dionysius*, in which that celebrated Writer censures their Ignorance, who know not that the Father, as Father, can be alienated from the Son; for that it is an especial Term of Connexion: and that the Son cannot be removed from the Father; for that the Term Father denotes Communion: and that the Holy Spirit is in the hands of them both, and cannot be separated from him that sent, and him that brought him. It is also a saying of the same Persons, (*b*) that the Indivisible and Indiminish'd Trinity is collected into Unity. Lastly, in his Answer to the fourth Quest. of *Paulus Samosat.* he thus speaks concerning the three Persons of the Trinity: The two Persons are inseparable, and also the Imperson'd or Subsistent Spirit of the Father, which was in the Son.

11. It remains that I shew, that the Fathers after the Rise of *Arianism* agreed with those before it. Now since the Places, which might be alledg'd for this purpose, are innumerable, we shall only give you a few for a Specimen. *Alexander* of *Alexandria* in his Epistle to *Alexander* of *Constantinople* writes thus upon that Text of St. *John*, *The only begotten Son who is in*

(*a*) Lib. 2. de Christo, Cap. 5. (*b*) *See the Annot. upon* Chap. 11.

the Bosom of the Father: (*a*) The Divine Teacher purposing to shew the two things inseparable from one another, the Father and the Son, said that he was in the Bosom of the Father. The same Person in the same Epistle says afterwards, that the Words of Christ, *I and the Father are One*, are a Declaration of his natural Glory, Pedigree, and Abode with the Father. Thus *Athanasius*: (*b*) But as he who says the Father and Son are two, means one God; so he who says there is one God, means two Persons, the Father and Son being one in Godhead, and that the Word by proceeding, or existing from him, is not to be parted, divided, or separated from the Father. *Pseudo Dionysius Areopagita*, as far as divine Things can be shadowed forth by corporeal, hath declared the mutual Existence of the Divine Persons in one another by an excellent Similitude: (*c*) The abiding of the Persons, which are of one Principle, one in another (if we may so speak) is united and common, and their Station or Place is universally united in the greatest degree; like the Lights of Lamps (to use a sensible and plain Example) which are in one House; they are all mutually entire and unmix'd; they have a real exact Distinction one from another, united in Distinction and distinguish'd in Union. For when there are many Lamps in one House, we see all the Lights united into one, and sending forth one undistinguish'd Illumination; nor cou'd any one, I suppose, part the Light of one Lamp from that of the others out of the Air which surrounds them all, or see one without the others, the Light of them being universally and mutually mix'd together. Now if any one should take one of these Lamps out of the House, all its own proper Light will depart with it, it will not take away with it any of the others Light, nor leave any of its own. For, as I said before, there was a perfect Union of them all

(*a*) *E. H.* Theodoret. Lib. 1. Ch. 4. pag. 11, 15. (*b*) Tom. 1. p. 1, pag. 624. (*c*) De Divinis Nominibus, Ch. 2.

to

to all entirely unmix'd, and in no part confounded. These things happen really in Bodies, the Air for instance; Light depending upon a material Fire: Yet we say that supereſſential Union is of an higher Nature than that of Bodies or Souls, or Minds, *&c.* It is very certain, *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* did not write theſe excellent Words: but it is alſo certain, that the Author was very antient. The very Learned and right Reverend Biſhop *Pearſon* (*a*) places him not far from the beginning of the fourth Century; and I am much of his mind.

12. *Baſil* explains this Matter well in many Places, Epiſtle the 42d (*b*) eſpecially, where he thus diſcourſes concerning the three Divine Perſons: We are not by any means to think of Section or Diviſion, ſo as to conceive the Son without the Father, or divide the Spirit from the Son. But there is in them a certain unſpeakable inconceivable Communion and Diſtinction, neither the Diverſity of Perſons diſtracting the Conjunction of Nature, nor the Community of Eſſence confounding the Property of their Diſtinction. *Baſil* hath more worthy your reading, which follows in the ſame Place. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* (*c*) ſays the Father is the Son's natural place. *Euthymius* does indeed briefly, yet accurately explain (*d*) the whole Notion of the Circumminceſſion in theſe Words: We ſay theſe Perſons are in one another, becauſe of their mutual containing and inferring one another; —— becauſe they are infinite and immenſe, and becauſe the Godhead of them all is one. *Damaſcene* in more places than one diſcourſes upon this Point, and explains it well. (*e*) *Thus*, after he had ſaid, that Subjects in a created Nature are not one in another, but exiſt ſeparately, and that we therefore ſay two, or three, or many Men; he ſhews that the manner, in which the Perſons of the Holy Trinity exiſt,

(*a*) Vind. Ignat. pag. 1. Ch. 10. (*b*) Tom. 3. pag. 97. (*c*) In ſeptimo Lib. Theſaur. (*d*) Part 1. Tit. 2. Panoplia. dogm. Orthod. Fidei. (*e*) In Lib. 1. de Orthod. Fide, Ch. 11.

is different: For we can't assign any local Distance, when we speak of the unlimited Deity, as we can with respect to ourselves. For the Persons are in one another, not so as to be confounded, but contain'd according to the Word of the Lord, *I in the Father, and the Father in me.* And a little after he says, The Deity, in a word, is indivisible in parts, and like the one mixture and conjunction of Light in three Suns, contiguous and without interval. Where he almost uses the same Similitude, that the *Pseudo-Dionysius* did. (*a*) *Again*, speaking of the Divine Persons, he says, That they cou'd not depart, or be distant from one another, that they were united and mutually contained one another without confusion; united without confusion, for they are three, tho united; divided without Interval, for tho every one subsisted by himself, was a perfect Person, and had his own Property, or different Manner of Existence; yet they are united in Essence, in Physical Properties, in that they are not distant, they cannot depart from the Father's Person. They are, and are called one God. To these Testimonies of the *Greeks*, I shall only add for the Reader's refreshment the Hymn of *Synesius* Bishop of *Cyrene*, who flourish'd in the beginning of the 5th Century. I celebrate thee, O Trinity. Thou art one and three. Thou art three and one. In Conception divided, but thy Division is indivisible. Hymn 3, so also Hymn 4.

13. Of the *Latins*, *Marius* (*b*) *Victorinus* thus speaks concerning God the Father and the Son: When we confess each of them God, we only mean one God, and both of them that one God; because the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father. So *Ambrose* says, (*c*) Both the Father is Lord, and the Son Lord: *The Lord said to my Lord*, but not two Lords, but one Lord; because both the Father is God, and the Son God, yet but one God; because the Father is in

(*a*) In Lib. 3. Ch. 5. (*b*) In initio Lib. 2. adv. Arium. (*c*) Lib. 10. in Lucam ad Ch. 20.

the

the Son, and the Son in the Father. *Again*, (*a*) The Father and Son have a Distinction, as Father and Son, but no Separation of Divinity. *Again*, (*b*) He thus briefly and neatly expresses both the Unity of Principle and the Circuminceſſion: He is therefore call'd God the Father, becauſe he is the Fountain, and the Wiſdom, becauſe that by which all things were diſpos'd; and the Love, becauſe that by which they will that all things ſhould ſo remain as they are diſpos'd. The Fountain then, and he that is of it, and he by whom theſe Two love another, are Three, and theſe Three are therefore One, becauſe theſe Two are ſo of One, as not to be ſeparate from him: but they are from him, becauſe not of themſelves; and they are in him, becauſe not ſeparate; and they are the ſame as he, and he the ſame as they, and they not the ſame as he, and he not the ſame as they. Here he joins together the Unity of Principle, and the Circuminceſſion, ſhewing that the Son and Holy Spirit are not only from the Father, but in him, nor can any way be ſeparated from him; and therefore that all the Three are one God, one and the ſame in Nature and Eſſence, but three in Subſiſtence. *Hilary* (*c*) ſays, The Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father, by the Unity of an inſeparable Nature, not confus'd, but undivided; not mixt, but common; not coherent, but exiſtent; not inconſummate, but perfect. For it is a Nativity, not a Diviſion; a Son, not an Adoption; a God, not a Creation. The Apoſtle holding this Faith of the Son abiding in the Father, and the Father in the Son, ſays, that there is to him, *one God the Father, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Where, when *Hilary* denies the Union of the Father and Son to be coherent, he only excludes ſuch Coheſion as is ſeen in material Things. Otherwiſe the Catholick Doctors have not been afraid to ſay, that the Father and the Son are

(*a*) Lib. 2. de Fide, cap. 2. (*b*) De Dignitate conditionis humanæ, cap. 11. (*c*) De Trin. Lib. 8.

mutually coherent. *Jerome*, upon the third Chapter of *Ezekiel*, says, The Son is the Place of the Father, and the Father of the Son, according to our Lord and Saviour, *I in the Father, and the Father in me.* Lastly, *Fulgentius* (*a*) teaches, That one Man is with another, by whom he is greatly belov'd, after another manner than the Word is with the Father. For a Man is so with a Man, as that he not only can be from him, but also when he is with him, cannot be substantially in him. He who is thus with another, is truly without him; because when he is with him in the Sincerity of Love, he is from him in Place, how greatly soever they be join'd in Affection. But the Word is so with God, as the Word is in the Mind, or Counsel in the Heart. For when the Mind hath the Word with it, it hath it by thinking; for to talk with one's self, is nothing else but to think. When therefore the Mind thinks, and by Thinking begets the Word within itself, it begets the Word of its own Substance; and so begets that Word of itself, that even when begotten, it hath it within itself. Nor is the Word any thing inferior to the Mind, of which it is born, because, as great as the Mind is which begets the Word, so great is the Word itself. For as the Word is born of the whole Mind, so when born, it remain'd within the whole Mind. And because when the Mind thinks, there is no Part of it, in which the Word is not, therefore the Word is as great as the Mind, of which it is; and when it is with it, is in it; and, as great as it is, so great is the Word, because it is of the Whole, and in the whole Mind. The Word is as great as the Mind and Word together; nor is the Word so born of the Mind, as to be locally sever'd from it.

14. Of the Circumincession of the Persons in the sacred Trinity, we further observe three Things.

(*a*) Lib. 3. ad Monimum, cap. 17.

First,

First, When some of the *Antients* (*a*) attribute this Circuminceſſion to the two Natures in Chriſt, which they aſſert do penetrate, mutually embrace, or contain each other, we are to determine that there they ſpeak improperly. For ſince the Circuminceſſion is properly the Union of thoſe Things, which do mutually every way penetrate one another, (as the Preposition denotes) it is requiſite to it, that neither of the Things ſo united be without the other, but that whereſoever the one is, there the other ſhould exiſt alſo. Now in Chriſt, the Divine Nature does indeed penetrate the Humane every way, but not ſo the Humane the Divine: For that is finite and circumſcrib'd, this infinite and immenſe; upon which account it cannot be, that this ſhould be whereſoever that is. But in the Trinity the Circuminceſſion is truly proper and perfect; for the Perſons mutually contain one another, and all Three have an immenſe Place, ſo that whereſoever one Perſon is, there are the other two, *i. e.* they are all every where. Whence *Tertullian* (*b*) ſays, You are to know that God is within the very Abyſs, is every where, and that the Son alſo is indiviſible from him, is every where with him. *Secondly*, I would obſerve to my Reader, that this Doctrine of the Circuminceſſion of the Perſons in the Trinity, is ſo far from bringing in *Sabellianiſm*, that it is very uſeful (as *Petavius* alſo hath obſerv'd) to prove the Diverſity of the Perſons, and refute that Hereſy. For in order to that mutual Exiſtence in one another, which we ſee in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, it is neceſſary that there be ſome Diſtinction of thoſe that are join'd together, that is, that thoſe which exiſt in one another, be really, and not in Notion only different. For that which is ſimply one, is not ſaid to be in itſelf, or to penetrate itſelf. This (*c*) *Cyril* of *Alexan-*

(*a*) Gregor. Naz. Orat. 51. p. 740. Damaſcen. de Orthod. Fide, Lib. 3. cap. 5. (*b*) Adv. Prax. cap. 3. (*c*) Lib. Theſaur. 12.

dria hinted: That by this their appearing to be this in that, and that in this, he might ſhew the Identity of the Godhead, and the Unity of Eſſence; and by their being one in another, they might not be conceived to be one numerical Thing. See alſo the place of *Pſeudo-Dionyſius, before cited.* Laſtly, This is eſpecially to be conſider'd, that this Circumminceſſion of the Divine Perſons is indeed the greateſt Myſtery; which we ought rather religiouſly to adore, than curiouſly examine. No Similitude, no Words can ever be found every way expreſſive of it: It is an Union above all other Unions, as the learned *Pſeudo Dionyſius* hath told us. We ſpeak, we think in ſuch Obſcurity, like Children concerning this and other Myſteries! Whilſt we are here, we behold our God, as it were in a Glaſs, darkly; but the Time will come, the Eternity which far exceeds all Time, in which we ſhall ſee him Face to Face. The Beatifick Viſion will diſpel all the Darkneſs of our Minds; which that he of his divine Mercy may grant us, let us always moſt earneſtly pray. In the mean time, whilſt we are Travellers here, we rather wiſh to know (as the learned *Athenagoras* (*a*) ſays) than clearly know, what is the Union of the Son to the Father, what the Communion of the Father with the Son, what the Spirit is, what is the Union of them, what their Diſtinction when united, namely, of the Father, Son, and *Holy Spirit.*

The Concluſion of the whole Work.

WE are now, by the Grace of God, arrived, and I hope happily, thro' the immenſe Sea of the Antients, at our deſigned Port. I think I have performed what I promiſed in the Beginning; namely, I

(*a*) Athenagor. p. 12.

have

have ſhewn, by many clear Teſtimonies, that Primitive Antiquity agrees with the *Nicene* Fathers in theſe four Points: (1.) That the Lord Chriſt exiſted in his better Nature before the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, yea before the Creation, and that all things were made by him. (2.) That he in that very Nature was conſubſtantial with God the Father, *i. e.* not of any created, mutable Eſſence; but altogether of the ſame Nature with the Father, and therefore true God. (3.) Which is a Conſequence of the former, that he is coeternal with God the Father, *i. e.* a Divine Perſon co-exiſting with the Father from Eternity. (4.) Laſtly, That this notwithſtanding, he is ſubordinate to God the Father, as his Author and Principle. The firſt I handled lightly and by way of Stricture, becauſe the *Arians* confeſs it; tho' by this Conceſſion, namely, that God the Father made all things out of nothing, by the Son, they plainly appear to me to have betrayed their own Cauſe. For I'm of opinion, with the more ſound *Schoolmen*, that a power of producing other things out of nothing can't be communicated to a Creature made of nothing, ſuch as the *Arians* dreamt that the Son was. Of theſe Schoolmen *Eſtius* ſaith *(a)*, That a Creature cannot be advanced, by ſupernatural Power, to act as a phyſical Inſtrument in the Work of Creation; becauſe it is of the nature of ſuch an Inſtrument to act by ſomething of its own Power, ſuitably to or in conformity with the acting of the principal Cauſe. For which reaſon the Divine Power cannot give to a Creature the Power to create, as a phyſical Inſtrument, without deſtroying the proper Nature of its phyſical *Efficiency* or Inſtrumentality. The Foundation of this Argument he had before explained in the ſame Place: Nothing can be the Cauſe of Creating, but what hath an infinite Power. For by how much the Form to be produced is the more remote from Power, ſo much the greater Power is required

(*a*) In lib. 2. Diſtinct. 1. Sect. 4. Vide etiam Athanaſium.

in

in the Agent; therefore an infinite Power is required to produce a Form out of no Power, which is done in Creation. Now it is impossible this should be communicated to any Creature. Hence, namely from the Work of the Creation, common to the Son with the Father, the antient, yea the *Ante-Nicene* Catholicks concluded the Divinity of them both common. *Origen* himself expressly teaches, that nothing but the Word of God, that is, nothing but very God could perfect the Creation of all things (*a*). For upon that place of *Genesis*, *Let us make Man*, &c. and upon that of the Psalmist, *He spoke, and they were made*, he thus discourses in the same Place: For if God commanded, and the Creatures were made, who, according to the Prophet, should be the Executor of so great a Command of the Father, but he, if I may so speak, who is his animated Word and Truth? Nay, the most antient Fathers generally sharply reproved the *Gnostics* for teaching, that this World was made by Angels, and Powers different from and inferiour to God. The Places of *Irenæus* (*b*) above-cited are especially clear in this Point: The only one God the Creator is he, who is above all Principality, Dominion, and Power; this Father, this God, this Creator, and Maker, he made these things by himself, *i. e.* by his Word and Wisdom he made the Heaven, the Earth, the Sea, and all that is in them. *Again* (*c*), Therefore the Angels did not make or form us, nor could the Angels make the Image of God, nor any one, no Power distant from the Father of all things, but the Word of the Lord. For God did not stand in need of them to make what he had determined with himself to have made, as tho' he had not Hands of his own. For his Word and Wisdom are always with him, the Son and Spirit, by whom, and in whom he freely made all things, to whom he speaks also,

(*a*) Sect. 2. chap. 9. n. 5. (*b*) Sect. 2. Chap. 5. n. 7. Iren. Lib. 2. ch. 55. p. 214. (*c*) Lib. 4. Ch. 37. p. 369.

saying,

saying, *Let us make Man after our own Image and Similitude*; taking from himself the Substance of the Creatures, the Copy of the Things made, and the Figure of the Ornaments in the World. In which Places, *Irenæus* clearly teaches, That God the Father neither made, nor had occasion to make, nor cou'd make the World by any thing extrinsic of himself; and at the same time as plainly teaches, that he created all things by the Son and Holy Spirit.

I have very largely demonstrated the second Point, concerning the Consubstantiality of the Son, because the Controversy manifestly depends upon it. If in this particular, Primitive Antiquity appear on our side, the Cause will soon be determin'd in all the other Parts of it with the *Arians*. For this being granted, that the Son is of the same Nature and Essence with the Father, the whole Frame and Structure of their Heresy is overturn'd. But they can't name one *Ante-Nicene* Doctor who hath not confessed the Consubstantiality. As for the third Point, I have evidently shewn, that the greatest and better part of the Primitive Fathers, have clearly and plainly profess'd to believe the Son's Eternity; and that the other Doctors of the Church, who attributed to the Son a Generation from some Beginning, tho they differed from the other in Words, agreed with them in Sense. Lastly, I have clearly prov'd, that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers did not define any other Subordination of the Son to the Father, than the Catholicks acknowledg'd, who wrote after, and against *Arius*; and that their harsher Expressions do not only admit, but require a Catholick Sense. From all this it is manifest, that *Petavius* was too liberal, in allowing to the *Arians* the Suffrages of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers; and, that *Sandius* and others, who relying upon the Authority of that Jesuit, boldly affirm'd, that all the Doctors of the first Ages were of *Arius*'s Opinion, are mistaken.

The Opinion of the Catholick Fathers, who engaged the *Arians* in former Days, was widely different from

from this. They were so far from being afraid of the Primitive Doctors, that they willingly appealed to them. *Athanasius* (*a*) after he had cited the Testimonies of some Antients in defence of the *Nicene Creed*, thus speaks to the *Arians*: Behold we shew, that the Notion has passed from *Fathers to Fathers*; but you *Novel Jews*, and Disciples of *Caiaphas*, what Fathers can ye produce for your Forms? You cannot name us one wise or prudent Man. All abhor you but the Devil: He only was to you the Author of such an Apostasy. *Athanasius* had seen Pieces of the Antients, which to the great detriment of the Church are now lost: But of all he had read, he boldly asserts, and that, not in a Sermon to the People, but in a written Disputation against the *Arians*, that the *Hereticks* cou'd not produce one approved Author, who defended their Blasphemies. And indeed, we have sufficiently prov'd in this Work, that there was not one of the Antient Catholick Fathers, whose Divine Writings Providence has secur'd from the Shipwreck, to us their late Posterity, who was not of the Side of the *Nicene Bishops*. Nay, the very *Arians* themselves, tho they pretended to the ignorant Populace, that they held the Faith deliver'd by the Fathers, and gave some Colour to their Heresy, from certain Sayings of some Fathers not rightly understood (as we have shewn before) yet, when press'd in Disputation, absolutely declin'd the Judgment and Authority of the Antients. The Story of *Sisinnius* in *Socrates*, (*b*) which we hinted before, is a noted one. * The Emperor *Theodosius* having sent for the Bishop *Nectarius*, seriously discoursed with him, about some Method of freeing the

(*a*) Vol. 1. Tom. 1. p. 233. (*b*) *Socrat.* H. E. Lib. 5. Ch. 10.

* *See also the Story of* Acesius *in the same* Socrates, p. 32. *His Answer to* Constantine, *when ask'd whether he wou'd subscribe the Nicene Creed, was this: The Synod, O King, has defined nothing new: I have read this Definition of Faith——as what was antient Tradition, even from the Beginning, the very Times of the Apostles.*

Christian

Christian Religion from Differences, and restoring the Unity of the Church. He said the Controversy which divided the Churches ought to be discussed; that thus the Occasions of Discord being taken away, Peace might be recalled. Upon hearing this, *Nectarius* was anxious and sollicitous. He sent for *Agellius*, then a *Novatian* Bishop, but one who agreed with him in the Faith, and open'd to him the Emperor's Purpose: *Agellius*, otherwise a Pious and Religious Man, but not able to engage in a close Dispute, chose *Sisinnius* his Reader, to undertake that Province. But *Sisinnius*, an Eloquent and a Prudent Man, one, who besides his knowledge of the Holy Writ understood the *Greek* Philosophy excellently, well-knowing that *Heresy* was rather inflamed than Divisions healed by such Disputations, gave *Nectarius* this Advice: Since he was assur'd that the Antients had been very cautious of attributing to the Son any Beginning of Existence, as thinking him Co-eternal with the Father, he persuades him to wave Logical Branglings, to bring in Evidence the Expositions of the Fathers, and to put the Emperor upon asking the Leaders of the respective Sects, whether they thought regard was to be had to the Antient Doctors who taught before the Division in the Church, or whether they rejected them as Aliens to the Christian Religion. If they reject them, you may then venture to anathematize them. Now if they presume to do that, they will be thrust out by the People; and thus the Truth will plainly appear victorious. But if they shall not reject the Antient Doctors, it will be our business to produce their Books. *Socrates* proceeds to inform us, that *Nectarius* communicated this Advice to the Emperor, who eagerly embrac'd it, and upon the Experiment, observes, that the *Hereticks* depended upon Logical Disputation, not the Exposition of the Antients: for they all refused to abide by the Judgment of the Fathers. *Sozomen* (*c*) gives us the same

(*c*) Pag. 583. Lib. 7. Ch. 12.

Story.

Story. To which we may add, what *Alexander* of *Alexandria* witneſſeth, (*d*) That the firſt Champions of *Arianiſm* deſpis'd the Antient Doctors, and like the preſent *Fanaticks* and *Enthuſiaſts*, impudently boaſted, that they themſelves were taught by Inſpiration. For thus he writes in his Epiſtle to *Alexander* of *Conſtantinople:* They will not have any of the Antients compar'd with them; they cannot bear to be ſet upon a Level with our Maſters from our Childhood; nor do they think that any of our Collegues in the Miniſtry have attain'd even a ſmall ſhare of Wiſdom. They ſay, that they alone are wiſe, †mortify'd to Worldly-things: The Inventors of Doctrines, and that that is reveal'd to them alone, which never enter'd into the Thoughts of any other Perſon under the Sun. In theſe Words *Alexander* ſignifies, that the *Arian* Notion is not only contrary to the Doctrine of the Antients, but alſo to that of his immediate Predeceſſors, and of all the Biſhops, who govern'd the Church at that time, when *Arius* firſt raiſed the unhappy Controverſy.

But you'll ſay, if the Opinion of *Arius* was ſo Heterodox, how came it ſo greatly to prevail in a ſhort time after its riſe, that almoſt the whole Chriſtian World became *Arian*, as *Jerom* complain'd? I anſwer, that if by [becoming *Arian*] be underſtood embracing the genuine Tenets of *Arius*, with *Jerom*'s leave it is not true, that the greateſt part of Chriſtians was *Arian.* In the days of *Conſtantius* indeed, and ſome time after, very many came over to the *Arians;* but few, comparatively ſpeaking, to *Arianiſm.* Thoſe deceitful Mortals concealed their impious Doctrines, and profeſſed their Faith in Words, which exhibited the antient Catholick Sentiment; unleſs when they

(*d*) Theod. Eccl. H. Lib. 1. Ch. 4. p. 16.

† Ἀπλῶμενες, *no Rendring, nor Criticiſm I can meet with, pleaſes me. Peter, is neither true in fact, nor ſeems any way ſignificative here. The* Arians *were Powerful, Popular and Intriguing; but if they had not been ſo, they were unlikely to boaſt of their Poverty, in delivering their Opinion about an Article of Faith.*

found

found an Audience fit for their Purpose: whence it came to pass, that these were almost every-where taken for, and acknowledg'd as Catholicks, even by those, who heartily detested their Tenets. By this Fraud they got into the Favour, of not only the Christian People, but many over-credulous Bishops. Read the *Arian Creeds* copy'd by *Athanasius* and others, for the most part expressed in such Catholick Terms, that you wou'd scarce believe their Compilers were of another Strain. They say Christ is God, true God, nay true and perfect God by nature; That he is a Creature, they hold to be an abominable Assertion, and professe he existed before all Ages. What Catholick Expression do they not use, except the *Homoousion* or *Consubstantial?* Hence *Hilary*, who lived in this Reign of *Anti-Christianism*, congratulated the Truth, that the Christian People remain'd Catholick under the *Arian* Bishops, with whom they commun cated. The innocent People received with all reverence such Bishops as *Constantius* set over them, not knowing the impious Tenets they held; they admitted the *Hereticks*, but never embrac'd their *Heresy*, as not understanding they were guilty of it. The Words of (*e*) *Hilary* are worthy the recital. Now I think *Anti-Christ* should have been introduc'd and believ'd on by these Wretches with less *Perfidiousness*. They give Christ the Name of God, beause this Name is given to Men. They confess, that he is truly the Son of God, because by the Sacrament of Baptism every one is truly made so. They own him to be before Times and Ages, in such a Sense, as is not to be deny'd of Angels and the Devil. Thus our Lord Christ hath only such Attributes given him as are proper to Angels, or to us: But what is lawfully and truly due to Christ God is deny'd, namely, that he is true God, *i. e.* that his Divinity is the same as the Father's. And even to this day the growth of this Impiety is promoted by Fraud, in so much that the Christian People don't fall away under their *Anti-*

(*e*) Lib. contra Arian. & Auxent. p. 215.

Christian

Christian Priests, whilst they believe that to be the Faith, which is only the Form. They hear that Christ is God, and they think it sincerely spoken; they hear he is the Son of God, and they think, that the Truth or real Essence of God is in the Nativity or Birth of God. They hear that he is before Times, and they think before Times, and Always, to be the same. The Ears of the People are more Holy than the Hearts of the Priests. Thus *Hilary* excellently speaks: But (*f*) *Alexander* of *Alexandria*, in his Letter to his Namesake of *Constantinople*, testifies, that *Arius* and his first Disciples, after they had been condemn'd in a certain Synod at *Alexandria*, held before that of *Nice*, by *dissimulation* obtain'd commendatory Letters to other Bishops, which they frequently made use of to confirm those poor Creatures in Error, whom they had deceiv'd. They have endeavour'd, *says he*, making Excursions against us, to pass over to our Collegues of the same Opinion with us, pretending a desire of Peace and Unity, but really attempting by fair Speeches to infect some of them; desiring fulsome Letters of them, that by reading them to those they have deceiv'd, they may harden them in Impiety, and render them impenitent in their Errors, as having the Suffrage and Sentiment of Bishops with them. They don't confess to them their wicked Life and Doctrine, for which we cast them out; but either say nothing of these Matters, or glossing them with forg'd Words and Letters, they deceive. They catch him that is exposed to Error, by gilding over their pernicious Doctrine with plausible and cunning Speeches, not forbearing to calumniate our pious Principle to all Men. Whence it is, that some have subscribed their Letters, and received them into the Church. If any of the *Arians* question the Credit of this good Man *Alexander*, let him hear two of the most noted of his own Party, *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis*. They in their *Penitentiary Libel* write, that they had indeed subscribed the *Nicene*

(*f*) Theod. E. H. Lib. 1. Ch. 4. p. 10.

Creed

Creed (*a*), but refus'd the *Anathematiſm*; and immediately ſubjoin their Reaſon for it in theſe Words: Not as cenſuring the Creed, but as not believing that the Perſon accuſed was ſuch an one [as repreſented] being fully aſſured that he was not, both by Letters particularly wrote to us by him, and alſo by perſonal Diſcourſe with him. What *Valeſius* has obſerv'd is worthy Notice, (*b*) namely, that this *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia* held conſtant Communion with the Church of *Rome* till his Death. Whence one of theſe things follows: either, that *Euſebius* was not really an *Arian*, but had believ'd their Profeſſions, and made one of their Party thro too much Credulity; or, that tho he was an *Arian*, he deceiv'd the Church of *Rome* by the ſame Arts, which the other *Arians* uſed. Any one will rather think the latter true, who ſhall attentively read (*c*) the *Letter* of *Arius* to this *Euſebius*, and that of this *Euſebius* to *Paulinus* at *Tyre*. Who is not ſhock'd with the Account *Socrates* gives of (*d*) *Arius* from the Authentick Letters of *Conſtantine*? The Emperor willing to make an Experiment upon *Arius*, ſent for him to the Palace, and ask'd him, whether he agreed to the Definitions of the *Nicene Council*. He readily, and without delay, ſubſcribed in a Sophiſtical manner the Definitions of Faith before them. The Emperor amazed, gave him his Oath. By the ſame Arts he took this alſo. The Fraud of his Subſcription, as I have heard, was this; *Arius, ſays my Author*, having wrote his own Opinion in a Paper, carry'd it under his Arm, and ſwore, that he really believed as he had wrote. That this was ſo, I write from Fame, but that he ſwore to what he had ſubſcribed, I have read in the Emperor's Epiſtles. No Man ſure can wonder, that the remarkable Divine Vengeance recorded by *Socrates* in the ſame Place, ſhould follow up-

(*a*) *Socrates*, Lib. 1. Ch. 14. p. 36. (*b*) Vide Valeſii notas, p. 145. (*c*) Theod. *E. H.* p. 20. Lib. 1, Ch. 5, *and* 6. (*d*) *Socrates*, *E. H.* Lib. 1. Ch. 38. p. 61.

on ſo deteſtable a Perjury. Other Eccleſiaſtical Writers tell the ſame Story, tho with different Circumſtances.

Athanaſius, in his Book of the Synods of *Rimine* and *Seleucia*, witneſſeth, that *George* the Biſhop of *Laodicea* was the firſt who perſuaded the *Arians* to diſguiſe their Impiety in Catholick Expreſſions. (*a*) For he reports of *George*, that he wrote to the *Arians*, Why do you blame * *Pope Alexander* for ſaying the Son is of the Father? Fear not your ſelves to ſay, that the Son is of God. For if the Apoſtle wrote, that all things are of God, and it is manifeſt that all things were made of nothing, and the Son is a Creature, and one of thoſe things which were made, the Son alſo may be ſaid to be ſo of God, as all things are of God. The *Arians* then learn'd of him feignedly to pronounce the Words *is of God*, to uſe them in a bad Senſe.

But the *Arians* ſeem to have their moſt ſpecious pretence from the Word *Homoouſion*, eſtabliſh'd by the *Nicene Fathers*. For the *Sophiſts* complain'd, that they were condemn'd by the *Nicene Fathers* for rejecting one little Word, no where found in the Scriptures, and of dangerous meaning, whereas otherwiſe they in nothing receded from the Antient Catholick Faith. Many believing this Profeſſion of theirs, not only of the People, but alſo of the Catholick Biſhops, freely gave them the right-hand of Chriſtian Fellowſhip and Communion; not aware of the *Arian* Perfidy, abhor'd thoſe Catholick Biſhops, who cloſely adhered to the *Homoouſion*, as contentious Men, given to Diſputations about Words, Diſturbers of the Church's Peace for Trifles, nay *Hereticks*, who under that Word conceal'd an Heterodox Sentiment. Now as many as rejected the Word *Homoouſion* upon any Score, tho they from their Heart acknowledged the Catholick Meaning of the Word, which the *Nicene Fathers* intended, theſe, who were very many, were generally accounted *Arians*.

(*a*) Vol. 2. Tom. 1. Pag. 731. * *Biſhop of Alexandria.*

For

For this Cauſe chiefly, *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* was, I ſuppoſe, call'd an *Arian*; namely becauſe, tho he never abſolutely diſlik'd the *Homoouſion*, yea always approv'd it in the Senſe of the *Nicene Fathers*, he openly oppos'd *Euſtathius* and other celebrated Catholicks, who, as he thought, uſed it in a Senſe too favourable to *Sabellianiſm* (*a*). What ſay you to *Theodoret* alſo, (*b*) who teſtifies, that the Emperor *Conſtantius*, a moſt bitter Enemy to the Defenders of the *Homoouſion*, was really always a Catholick? For tho being deceiv'd by his Managers, he did not admit the Word *Homoouſion*, he ſincerely acknowledg'd the Senſe of it: For he called the Word God, the genuine Son begotten of the Father before Ages, and plainly condemn'd thoſe who preſum'd to ſay that he was a Creature. This Teſtimony of *Theodoret* is greatly confirm'd by the Encomium *Gregory* (*c*) *Nazianzen* gives of *Conſtantius*, amongſt other Names calling him the moſt Divine Prince, and a very great Lover of Chriſt. Theſe Praiſes *Nazianzen* never wou'd have heap'd upon *Conſtantius*, as a Catholick indeed, and a profeſſed Enemy of the *Arians*, if he had imbib'd their Hereſy. To this we may add, that the *Arian* Confeſſions publiſh'd in their Conventicles aſſembled under *Conſtantius*, did moſt of them profeſs the ſame Faith in Words, as the *Nicene Council* decreed, except only the *Homoouſion*. For the *Sophiſts* well knew, that the Emperor's Pious and Catholick Soul could not bear their impious Tenets, if ſimply and honeſtly propos'd. Thus, he who was the greateſt Patron of the *Arians*, from his Heart abhor'd the genuine Tenets of *Arius*; and again, he who was the ſevereſt Perſecutor of the Catholicks, did always really hold the Catholick Faith and Opinion. This ſo great a Prodigy appear'd in the Chriſtian World, through the Fraud of the *Arians*, never enough to be deteſted by all good Men! *Elias Cretenſis* (*d*) does in part expoſe this Fraud in

(*a*) *See the Obſervation out of* Socrates, Sect. 2. Ch. 1. n. 8. (*b*) E. H. Lib. 3. Ch. 3. p. 126. (*c*) In priori Invectiva adv. Julian. p. 63. (*d*) Comment. *in Greg. Naz.* p. 813.

theſe Words. The Emperor ſeduced by *Hereticks* gave the Impious, Privileges againſt the Pious, and made Laws againſt the Orthodox Doctrine. For when the *Arians* craftily and wickedly brought in the Word Equiſubſtantial (ſo *Elias* renders ὁμοιούσιον) inſtead of Conſubſtantial, the Emperor came into their Sentiment, wrote, that Equiſubſtantial was the ſame as Conſubſtantial, and of no detriment at all to Piety. This indeed is not Heterodox (for that which is like, is not the ſame with that to which it is like, but partly equal and partly unequal) if piouſly underſtood; namely ſo, as that the Words [without any difference] be taken along with that Word. Hence, moreover, the *Hereticks* got free power, and ſo rejected the Word *Conſubſtantial.* But if I wou'd fully explain all the (*a*) *Crafty Arts* of the *Arians*, in propagating their impious

(*a*) *Logical Niceties, Equivocal Expreſſions, Occaſional Salvoes and Reſerves, Refuſal of Antient Teſtimony, Intrigues with Miniſters of State, Subornation of Evidence, Inſinuations of ill Practices or Inclinations towards the Government, Offers of Preferment, and the moſt inhuman Force upon the Minds, the Bodies and Properties of their Adverſaries; Arts, as our Learned and Good Biſhop ſays, Crafty and Impious too; but yet ſo generally uſed, as that the moſt careleſs Reader may be left to himſelf to obſerve upon them, thro the whole courſe of the Arian Hiſtory.*

One Artifice more flagrant than the reſt, was an attempt to draw off the People from their Zeal for the Doctrine, by repreſenting the Controverſy as too minute, and concerning matters that might as well be let alone. The Writers of the preſent Age have come up to them, if not exceeded them in this particular: But the Caſe is much miſtaken: For the Doctrine of the Son's Divinity was rigidly inſiſted upon, but ſome particulars in explaining it, were thought too ſubtle. The Arian ſide we generally find charged with theſe Subtleties. Dr. Whitby *cites* Socrates *to this purpoſe. There* Conſtantine *writes, that the Controverſy was not about a* Principal Doctrine, *but* concerning very ſmall Matters, *vain and unneceſſary things, without which there might be* Unity in Faith and Opinion. *Whoever will look into the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, will find this to be all miſrepreſentation. Any of them will inform him, that the Doctrine was held to be a Principal one, but the Explication ſubtle, vain, unneceſſary, dangerous to be attempted by weak Men, and perplexing to the Populace. I ſhall only take Notice of a few Words in* Euſebius *and* Socrates, *which the Doctor has not obſerved,*

pious Sentiment, the Concluſion of this Book would make another: Wherefore I will here make an end. From what we have diſcourſed in this Work, it is plain, the *Nicene* is the Faith once delivered to the Saints, and always religiouſly preſerved in the Catholick Church of Chriſt. Let us therefore bravely contend for this Faith, as it becomes Men inflam'd with an Holy Zeal for God; and let us conſtantly perſevere in it to the end of our Lives. God grant we may.

To the moſt Holy and Undivided Trinity, God the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, be all Praiſe Glory and Honour, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

obſerved, and which ſome of his Friends like, as they are at preſent falſely tranſlated. Conſtantine *writes thus: When you,* Alexander, *ask'd the Opinion of your Presbyters concerning a certain Place in the Law, or rather concerning the* [ἰνὸς ματαίᾳ ζητήματος μέρος] *a part of an idle Queſtion. Here* Valeſius's *uſual Diligence and* Acumen *have forſaken him; for if he had collated this place with* Euſebius, *he wou'd have found* ζητήσεως *read, not* ζητήματος, *which (tho indeed he has there tranſlated it as tho he had read* ζητήματος) *will force us to tranſlate* [*concerning an idle, or vain part of a Queſtion*] *and that too ſuch an one, as was neceſſary and in general common to the Orthodox and the Arians.* Ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχετε λογισμὸν. (Euſeb. p. 391) *namely the Divinity of our Lord; the nominal Profeſſion of which, the Antient Arians greatly gloried in, earneſtly contended for, and declared abſolutely neceſſary.*

THE JUDGMENT OF THE Catholick Church OF THE Three First CENTURIES,

CONCERNING

The Necessity of Believing, That our LORD JESUS CHRIST is true GOD;

Asserted against M. SIMON EPISCOPIUS, and others.

PREFACE.

WHEN *I formerly perus'd the* Theological Institutions of Episcopius, *upon reading the Chapter* Concerning the Necessity of believing the Manner, in which Jesus Christ was the Son of God, (*a*) *I wrote, or rather drew the Out-Lines of, an Answer, for my own use, to the Arguments, by which the learned*

(*a*) Ch. 34. Lib. 4. Sect. 2.

Man

Man has there endeavour'd to prove, that the Article concerning the Divine Generation of the Son of God, our Saviour, from God the Father before Ages, was not taken in the Primitive Churches, for an Article necessary to be believed in order to Salvation; and that those Churches held Communion with such as deny'd it; with such as believed and taught, that Christ was a mere Man, and did not exist before the Blessed Virgin. This short Answer I have enlarg'd, and considerably augmented at the Instances of my Friends, having added to it three whole Chapters; in which, if I mistake not, I have clearly confuted Episcopius's *Opinion, from the Testimonies of the First Fathers and Ecclesiastical History.*

My Reason for publishing this Piece, such as it is, I'll give you in a few Words. Our own Nation within these few Years has produced several Books, in which the impious Authors, boldly defending sometimes the Arian, *sometimes the* Samosatenian *Heresy, have with all their Power attempted to destroy the Chief Article of our Faith; that, upon which the Whole of Christianity depends; namely, That of the Son of God born of God the Father before all Ages, very God of very God, by whom all things were made, who for our Salvation was incarnate, and made Man. The Censure that great Man* Zanchius *passes upon* Socinus, *and others of the same Strain in his days, I may justly apply to them: (a)* I have read, but with great Indignation, the foolish Dotage of our Modern *Arians* and *Photinians*; and can affirm this, that they fall far short of the Antient *Hereticks*. Every thing is either endless Repetition, or fresh Absurdity. *That these vain Men might neither glory against the Truth, nor seduce the Infirm, some of our own Country, Persons of Piety and Learning, have opposed their Books, and upon that account recommended themselves to the Favour and Applause of all good Men.*

Among these have appeared a sort of Men, as Mediators, of a pacificatory Genius, and an odd Design, to bring together Contraries, and reconcile the Catholick Church and Hereticks, i. e. Christ *and* Belial. *These Men, tho they pro-*

(a) *Ep. Dedicat. to his Book* de Tribus Elohim.

fess (I wish, sincerely) to believe, as the Catholicks do, the Truth of the Article, that the Son is Co-essential with God; suppose you need not insist upon it, that to Salvation it is sufficient to believe, no matter how, in Jesus Christ the Son of God *and Saviour of Mankind, and that you need not trouble yourself, whether he is only mere Man, by Grace and Adoption made a God, and promoted to Divine Honours; or whether he is really and by Nature God. They defend this their Opinion by much the same Arguments, as* Episcopius *has borrowed from* Socinus. *They talk loud, that the* Nicene Fathers *first establish'd the Consubstantiality of the Son, and rashly guarded it with an Anathema; but that the Primitive Church, more moderate, and as became a tender Mother, received those into her Bosom, who believed our Saviour nothing more than Man. This they go about to prove from the Creed commonly called the Apostles, and from a celebrated Passage in (a)* Justin Martyr. *This is also their Boast, and how little there is in it, the following Treatise will shew.*

The Assertion of Episcopius, *upon which they vainly build, and which I have undertaken to refute, is unbecoming any Man of Probity, and even a slender Acquaintance with the Fathers and Church History. I charge not* Episcopius *with Improbity. Charity forbids me to do that, and indeed I cannot think it. Was he ignorant then? No. But he can never escape the Censure of being inconsiderate, to pronounce so boldly in a matter of such importance, concerning the Opinion of the Primitive Church, before he well knew it himself; and to do the greatest dishonour to the Doctors, Bishops, Confessors and Martyrs of the best Ages, in representing them as perfectly indifferent in defending the chief Article of the Christian Religion. Thus the Case must stand. The Ingenious, and in many respects the very Learned Man had not carefully consulted, had absolutely despised the Antients. Hear what he says in his Answer to (b)* Father Wading's *empty Boasts of Fathers and Councils. He speaks his Mind*

(*a*) *Dial. with* Trypho. (*b*) Episcopius ad Wading. de Cultu Imaginum, *Vol.* 1. p. 132. *Ed. Bleau, Amsterd.*

very

very freely in these Words: I'll tell you my Thoughts once for all. You shall never engage me in that drudgery, my Friend; I seek no applause from such low Enterprizes, nor envy them the Glory of their great Reading, and capacious Memory, who are pleased to spend all their time and pains in those wild Researches of Fathers and Councils. I am not for buying Repentance at such a Price. *With him forsooth! diligently to peruse the laudable Study of the Fathers and Councils, is only to be spoken of in a Proverb* of Contempt. *It is only a low Ambition, a Loss of Time and Labour; something that will bring you to Repentance. A little after in the same Place he endeavours weakly to depreciate their Works, is out of humour with the Name and Style of Fathers usually given them, and at length thus concludes: (a)* This is the Reason why I do not give myself much Trouble about them.

But Oh, that he had here excepted the Fathers of the three first Ages at least! Had he spent more of his Time and Study upon them, he would have been more useful to himself and the Church of Christ. He would never have so far engaged in the Defence of Arius *and* Socinus, *as to palliate that Doctrine of theirs concerning the Person of our Saviour, as Erroneous perhaps, but not Heretical, from the Authority and Judgment of the Primitive Churches; which Doctrine all those Churches had unanimously condemn'd for a very pernicious, and a mortal Heresy.*

I think you have this abundantly prov'd in the Dissertation I now present to you, which may serve as the Complement, or Finishing of my Defence of the Nicene Creed, *publish'd some Years ago. For as in that Work, I have vindicated the* Nicene Creed *from the Calumnies of* Heretics, *and fully shewn the Doctrine of it exactly agreeable to the Faith of the Catholick Church in the three first Centuries (without a Reply, that I know of, from the Adversaries of the Holy Synod) so in this Piece I maintain and defend the Anathematism annex'd to that Creed. For it is hence plain,*

(a) P. 132, *and* 133.

that

that the Nicene Fathers, *agreeably to the Judgment of the first Churches, even from the Days of the Apostles, had establish'd their Creed under this Anathematism:* (*a*) The Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church anathematizes those that say that the Time was, when he was not, and he was not before he was born, and he was made of nothing; and that affirm he was of another Substance or Essence, or created, or convertible, or mutable. *All pious and sober Men must revere this Judgment of the whole Church of Christ in all times; and of consequence beware of, and entirely abhor the Heresy of the* Samosatenians *and* Arians, *which deny their God. Do you so, Reader, I seriously exhort you, whoever you are. Farewel.*

THE INTRODUCTION.

THE very learned *Episcopius* in his *Theological Institutions* shews, (*b*) *That God is called the Father of Jesus Christ, and that Jesus Christ is called the Son of God the Father, even as he is Man, in an eminent manner, in Holy Scriptures four ways; namely, upon account of his Conception by the Holy Spirit, his Mediatorial Office, his Resurrection from the Dead, and his Exaltation at the Father's Right-hand: He then adds, and proves it from certain Places of Holy Scriptures, and from Scriptural Consequence* (tho he behaves very coolly in all the Disputation of this important Truth) *that Jesus Christ is also the Son of God upon another and a more excellent account than any of those*

(*a*) *Socrates*, p. 21, 22. cap. 8. Lib. 1. (*b*) Lib. 4. Sect. 2. c. 33. p. 334. &c. Vol. 1.

four,

four, namely upon such an one, as could not respect him as Man; because the Scripture frequently speaks so of Jesus Christ, i. e. *He who was afterwards called Jesus Christ, as that it can scarce be doubted, whether he existed really, as the true and only Son of the Father, before he was born Man of* Mary *his Mother, and consequently* (as he afterwards more fully explains himself) *before the Creation, and that in such a manner, as to be the Author of it, and therefore God.*

He puts this Question, after his manner, at last: (*a*) *Whether that fifth Manner of Jesus Christ's Filiation be necessary to be known and believed, in order to Salvation; and those Persons are to be anathematiz'd, who deny it?* He undertakes to defend the Negative by *three Arguments.* Leaving the *two former* to be discussed by others, I propose to examine the last only, as properly falling to my Lot. His Argument is this: (*b*)

The Faith and Profession of this special Filiation, was not judged necessary to be known and believed in order to Salvation, in the Primitive Churches, down from the Apostles during three Centuries at least. Therefore there is no reason, why it should be thought necessary now. The Consequence is clear from the Rule of Vincentius Lirinensis: *What is necessary to be known and believed in order to Salvation, must have been determin'd to be held and believed as such every where, by all, and always.*

The Consequence we readily embrace; but the Antecedent (to pass by *Episcopius* his Solœcism, that the Faith and Profession, *&c.* was not necessary to be known and believed, *&c.* whereas doubtless he would have said, that Faith and Profession, *&c.* were not necessary to Salvation) we contend is plainly false, and will abundantly prove it in this Work.

One thing we must premise to our Reader, That the Judgment of the first Churches, concerning the Necessity of this, or any other Article of our Religion, cannot be otherwise better known by us, their late

(*a*) Ch. 34. p. 338. (*b*) P. 339. in fine.

Posterity,

Posterity, than first by consulting the extant Writings and Monuments of the Catholick Fathers, and more celebrated Doctors in those Churches, that we may thence know their Thoughts upon the Question; and then by searching Ecclesiastical History, concerning those, who in the first Ages deny'd the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, that we may understand what Judgment the Churches of those times pass'd upon them; whether they retain'd them in their Communion, or rejected them as Aliens from Christ's Body. There is indeed a third Method of distinguishing what Doctrines the Primitive Church held necessary to be believed; namely, by the Symbols and Confessions of Faith, which she required of all, who desired to enjoy her Communion. We don't decline this Method, nay we readily accept it, as will appear hereafter: But for as much as very many, in these worst of Times, interpret the Antient Creeds, as well as the Holy Scriptures, not according to the Rule of the Catholick Church (which *Vincentius* has told us of) but according to their own Pleasure; and for as much as *Episcopius* and his Followers have drawn an Argument for their Opinion from the Creed, commonly called the Apostles, I think it better to defer what I have to say of Creeds, till I come to answer their Reasonings from them.

These things premis'd, we shall easily refute *Episcopius*'s Assertion in this Method. (1.) I will bring the Testimonies of the First Fathers, very plainly teaching, That the Doctrine of the true Divinity of Christ is absolutely necessary to be believed in order to Salvation. (2.) I will shew from Ecclesiastical History, that never any one deny'd the Divine Generation of our Lord Jesus Christ from God the Father before all Ages, who was not excommunicated for it, and deem'd an *Heretick*. Lastly, I will put in a full Answer to those Arguments, which *Episcopius* has used, in order to prove his point. This is the End and Design of our Dissertation.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

The Teſtimonies of the Primitive Fathers, That the Article of our Lord's Divinity is abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd, in order to Salvation.

1.
will begin with the Teſtimonies of the firſt Fathers. *Ignatius*, a contemporary Biſhop with the Apoſtles, or at leaſt with St. *John*, in his genuine Epiſtles, publiſh'd by *If. Voſſius*, very often inculcates the Doctrine of Chriſt, God and Man, true God, and true Man, as abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd, againſt the Hereticks of that Age, who denied either of Chriſt's Natures. So, in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, after he had recited their Praiſes, which *Oneſimus* their Biſhop had given of them; namely, that they held faſt the orthodox and apoſtolick Doctrine, and kept themſelves pure from Hereſy: he admoniſhes them to perſevere in the Catholick Faith, uſing all Caution againſt Hereticks, who at that time were cunningly ſowing their Tares in the Field of the Church. His Words are theſe: *There are ſome who are wont to bear about the Name* [*of Chriſt*] *deceitfully, but act ſuch things as are unworthy of God. Such you ought to avoid as Beaſts. For they are mad Dogs, they bite privately. You ought to beware of them, as being themſelves in a deſperate State, difficultly to be cur'd,* [and therefore dangerouſly infectious.] The celebrated Place concerning the two Natures of Chriſt is ſubjoin'd: *There is one Phyſician, carnal and ſpiritual, made and unmade, God incarnate, the true Life in Death, both of* Mary *and of God.* Immediately

mediately follows: *Therefore let no Man deceive you, i. e.* in that great Truth explain'd to you in the Words preceding, concerning the two Natures of our Saviour. It is therefore very plain that the Hereticks noted by (*a*) *Ignatius*, denied the apoſtolical Doctrine of Chriſt being God and Man; and that the apoſtolical Man therefore cenſur'd them, as mad Dogs, biting privately, and injecting the deadly Poiſon of their Doctrine into the Minds of Men, as Perſons to be entirely avoided by all who would conſult their own Salvation.

It is moreover obſervable, that after the holy Man had ſaid theſe Hereticks were in the utmoſt Danger of their eternal Salvation, he gives this Reaſon for thus ſpeaking, immediately: *For there is one Phyſician, carnal and ſpiritual*, &c. As if he ſhould have ſaid, there is no Salvation for Men, but through that one Phyſician of Souls, Chriſt, who is God and Man, and the Mediator between God and Man: But theſe Men will not allow, don't acknowledge any ſuch Phyſician and Mediator; therefore their Salvation is deſperate, unleſs they at length ſeriouſly repent of their Hereſy, embrace, and with all Devotion reverence God the Son, incarnate and made Man for their Salvation.

The ſame Perſon afterwards, in the ſame Epiſtle, again pronounces theſe Hereticks worſe than the worſt of Men; he aſſigns them and their Followers to the Flames of Hell, and calls their Opinion a diabolical Doctrine. Theſe are his Words: (*b*) *Be not deceiv'd, my Brethren. They that defile the Houſe*, [their Bodies, by Adultery] *ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God. If then they who have done this in a carnal Senſe* [defil'd their own Bodies, which are call'd the Temples of the Holy Ghoſt, &c.] *are dead or periſh'd; how much more ſhall he who corrupts the* * *Faith of God, for*

(*a*) Pag. 13. Vol. 2. Patr. Apoſt. (*b*) P. 15.

* *Archbiſhop* Uſher *reads*, [*the Church*] *which preſerves the Antitheſis.*

which

which Jesus Christ was crucify'd, by evil Doctrine. Such an one is become defil'd, and shall go into unquenchable Fire, as shall also his Hearer. And a little after, (*a*) *Be ye not anointed with the ill Savour of the Doctrine of the Prince of this World.* He then proposes the Apostolical Faith, as opposite to this evil diabolical Doctrine, in these Words: *Our God Jesus Christ was conceiv'd by* Mary, *according to the Disposition of God, of the Seed of* David, *and of the Holy Spirit.* The mild *Ignatius* therefore thunders against these Seducers and Seduced; therefore threatens them with eternal Fire, because they endeavour'd to subvert the chief Truth of the Christian Religion [that great Mystery of Godliness, God manifest in the Flesh] of which every true Church, as the Apostle tells us, (*b*) *should be the Pillar and Basis*; by professing it, defending it by her Testimony, and preserving it by her preaching the Gospel. There were in the Times of *Ignatius* two sorts of Hereticks who attempted this Impiety, as contrary to one another, as they both were to the Truth; the one attributing to our Saviour a certain Divine Nature, absolutely divested him of the Human, affirming, that he only imaginarily liv'd, suffer'd, and died among Men, as a Man. Of this Heresy were the *Simonians*, *Menandrians*, *Saturninians*, &c. all which the latter Ages therefore call'd *Docetæ* and *Phantasiastæ*. The other, on the Reverse, only acknowledg'd an human Nature in Christ, namely, the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*. It is not easy to say, whether is the more dangerous Heresy; though the latter indeed does plainly reflect more upon the Dignity of our Lord's Person. The Learned agree, and it is in itself clear, that *Ignatius* had an eye to them both, as well in other Parts of his Epistles, as in the Places cited. Whosoever shall read these Passages, without Prejudice and Partiality, can never surely be of *Episcopius*'s mind, or believe that the Doctrine concerning the true Divinity of our

(*a*) P. 16. (*b*) 1 Tim. Chap. v. 15, 16.

Lord

Lord Jesus Christ, was not judg'd necessary to be believ'd, in order to Salvation in the primitive Church, much less that she held Communion with those that deny'd it, a thing *Episcopius* has ventur'd to affirm. Thus much for *Ignatius*.

2. We shall prove the same of *Justin* in a more proper Place, notwithstanding the Use *Episcopius* and his Followers make of him, for want of Candour or Skill.

3. In the mean time, let *Irenæus* succeed *Ignatius*. He, in his Youth, was a constant and a diligent Hearer of *Polycarp, a Disciple of the Apostle* (*a*); so that in his old Age, he very well retained the Words and Doctrine of that blessed Man, and therefore could easily be inform'd by him, what the Apostolical Church deem'd to be heretical. Now he, as well as *Ignatius*, every where in his Writings rejects those as Hereticks who denied Christ to be God-Man, true God and true Man, and pronounces them Aliens from the saving Knowledge of Christ. His Words concerning the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians* are very clear: (*b*) *But they again who say he is barely Man, begotten of* Joseph, *are dead, continuing in the Servitude of their former Disobedience, being not yet incorporate with the Word of God the Father, not through the Son obtaining Liberty, as he himself saith; If the Son make you free, then are you free indeed. Now not knowing him, who, born of the Virgin, is God with us, they are depriv'd of his Gift, which is eternal Life; and not receiving the incorruptible Word, they abide in the mortal Flesh, and are obnoxious to Death, not partaking of the enlivening Antidote.* Here he charges the Hereticks with two Errors, teaching that Christ is Man begotten of Man, not born of a pure Virgin; and that he is Man, and nothing else. Upon both these Errors, he denies their Salvation, affirming *that they are dead, continuing in the Servitude of their*

(*a*) Eusеb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 5. chap. 20.
(*b*) Lib. 3. chap. 21. p. 286.

former

former Disobedience; that they don't obtain Liberty thro' the Son; that they are depriv'd of the Gift of Christ, which is eternal Life; and lastly, are obnoxious to Death. Now he therefore especially pronounces this dreadful Sentence upon them, because they have not known *Immanuel*, or *God with us*, because they have not receiv'd the incorruptible Word, resting in the mortal Flesh; *i. e.* because they have not acknowledg'd the Divine, Incorruptible, and Immortal Nature of Christ.

Parallel to these are his Words against the *Ebionites* in particular. (*a*) *The* Ebionites *are mistaken, not receiving into their Souls the Union of God and Man by Faith.* And a little after, (*b*) *These therefore reject the Mixture of the Heavenly Wine, and will have the Earthly Water only, not taking God into their* (*c*) *Cup. They rest in that* Adam, *who was overcome and expell'd Paradise, not considering that, as from the beginning of our Formation in* Adam, *the Breath of Life, which was from God, united to Matter, animated the Man, and exhibited the rational Animal; so in the end, the Word of the Father, and the Spirit of God, united to the antient Substance of our Formation, hath made the living and perfect Man.* To these, add the Passage of *Irenæus*, cited by *Theodoret*; (*d*) *He will ask the* Ebionites, *how can they be sav'd, except he was God, who wrought the Salvation upon Earth? Or how shall Man go to God, unless God come to Man?*

4. (*e*) *Tertullian* affirms, that the Article concerning the Generation of God the Son, from God the Father, before Ages, is certainly part of that Rule of Faith, *which hath among Christians no Questions or Controversies but what Heresies introduce, and which make Hereticks.* This Place I shall cite at large *hereafter*; but besides, I shall in this Chapter, bring a remarkable Testimony for the Necessity of this Article, from *Tertullian*, as you'll find by and by.

(*a*) Lib. 5. chap. 1. p. 433. (*b*) Ibid. (*c*) Commixtionem. (*d*) Lib. 4. chap. 59. p. 397. (*e*) Tertull. p. 207.

5. To *Tertullian*, we must join *Novatian*, or the Author of the Book concerning the Trinity in *Tertullian*'s Works. In *that Book*, he condemns their Doctrine, as the most dangerous Heresy, and contumelious to the Father himself, who deny the Divinity of Christ, and say he is a mere Man, or a Creature. Thus he discourses: (*a*) *For it is very dangerous to say, that the Saviour of Mankind, the Lord and Prince of the whole World, to whom all things are given and granted by the Father, by whom all things were design'd, made, and dispos'd, the King of all Ages and Times, the Prince of all Angels, before whom nothing was,* except the Father †, *to say that he is only Man, and to deny his Divine Authority in these Things. This Contumely of the Hereticks, will redound to God the Father also; as though God the Father could not beget himself a Son: But the Blindness of Hereticks must not prescribe to Truth.* Again, the same Person expressly teaches, that he can't be sav'd, who does not own Christ to be God: (*b*) *Why then should we scruple to say, what the Scripture does not scruple? Why should a true Faith hesitate, where the Authority of Scripture is clear? Behold the Prophet* Hosea *speaking in the Person of the Father; Now I will not save them by the Bow, or by Horsemen, but I will save them* * *by the Lord their God. If God,* says he, *saves by God, when he saves no otherwise than by Christ; why then should Man doubt to call Christ God, whom he observes styled God by the Father in Scripture? Nay, if God the Father saves not but by God, and no one can be sav'd by God the Father, unless he confess Christ to be God, in whom and by whom the Father promises to give Salvation; as whosoever acknowledges him to be God, shall surely find Salvation in Christ God; so whosoever does not acknowledge him to be God, must lose that*

(*a*) Pag. 713.

† *These Words of* Novatian *are explain'd in the Defence of the* Nicene Creed, Sect. 3. chap. 8. §. 7.

(*b*) Ibid. & 714.

* *By the Word of the Lord their God. So* Jonathan's *Targum; and the Fathers generally expound the Place of Christ the Word and Son of God. See the* Def. of the Nic. F. Sect. 1. chap. 1. sect. 19.

Salva-

Salvation, which he can't any where else find but in Christ God. Lastly, speaking of both the sorts of Hereticks, those that say the Father is the Son, and those who deny the Son to be God, he truly and elegantly says, (*a*) *That our Lord is indeed crucify'd, as it were, between two Thieves, as he once was, and so receives the sacrilegious Reproaches of Hereticks on both sides.*

6. I now come to *Origen*, who, if any of the Antients, was a Free-thinker in Divinity, a Latitudinarian Father: But for all this, *discoursing* professedly of the necessary Articles of Christian Faith, he expresly gives this concerning the Son's Divinity a Place among the first. The Passage is a very remarkable one, and therefore I'll give it you, though something long. It is thus in the Apology of *Pamphilus Martyr*: (*b*) *Whereas there are many, who think they understand Christianity, and yet some of them differ from their Ancestors; and whereas the Doctrine of the Church is preserv'd, being deliver'd down from the Apostles by the Order of Succession, and remains in the Churches to this very Time, that only is to be believ'd true, which in nothing differs from the Church's Tradition. Now we must know that the holy Apostles, when they preach'd the Christian Faith, treated very plainly concerning some Points, which they believ'd necessary to Salvation for all Believers, though before those who were not forward in their Search after divine Knowledge; leaving the Reason of their Assertions to be enquir'd into by those, who should be thought worthy to receive from the Spirit the excellent Gifts of the Spirit, and especially the Gifts of the Word of Wisdom and Knowledge. Of other Points, they only said, that they were, but said nothing how, or whence they were; that so all those of their Posterity, who were more studious than others, and Lovers of Knowledge and Wisdom, might have Scope for the Exercise of their Wit, namely, those who should make themselves worthy and capable of Wisdom. Now the Particulars, which*

(*a*) Pag. 728.

(*b*) *Among* Jerome's *Works*, Tom. 9. p. 115, 116. Ed. Victor.

were plainly treated in the Apostolical Instruction, are these. First, *That there is one God, who made and compos'd all things, and who made them out of nothing, &c. That this God, as he had promised before by his Prophets, sent the Lord Jesus Christ in the last Days,* &c. *Then that this Jesus Christ, who came, was born of the Father, before every Creature. That he, when he had minister'd to the Father in the Creation of all things (for by him were all things made) emptying himself in the last Days, was made Man: Was incarnate, tho' God; and remain'd God, tho' made Man.* In these Words *Origen* says, that the Doctrine of the Son's Divinity was part of the Ecclesiastical Instruction deliver'd by the Apostles themselves, and always preserv'd in the Churches; and whereas the Apostolical Doctrine was of different Kinds, he places this Article among those, which they treated of very plainly, as being necessary for all, even the more rude and ignorant Believers.

In the same Apology (*a*) is cited *Origen*'s Book upon the Epistle to *Titus*. In this Book, upon these Words, *An Heretick reject after the third Admonition*, he comments thus: The Name of Heresy, as far as I can find, is thus also mark'd out in the Epistle to the *Corinthians*. *For there must be Heresies, that those who are approv'd may be made manifest among you.* And again to the *Galatians*, Heresy is reckon'd among the Works of the Flesh: *Now the Works of the Flesh are manifest, which are these, Fornication, Uncleanness, Wantonness, Idolatry, Witchcraft, Enmity, Contentions, Emulations, Wrath, Strife, Discord, Heresies,* &c. *of which I have told you before, that they who do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* By these Words we understand, that as they who are defil'd by Fornication, Uncleanness, and the Worship of Idols, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God; so neither shall they who are gone off to Heresy. Wherefore, according to the Apostle, we must as well avoid the Imputation

(*a*) Pag. 117.

of

of Hereſy, as the other Evils enumerated by him, and not ſo much as join in Prayers with ſuch Perſons. A little after, *Origen* ſhews who are to be accounted Hereticks, in theſe Words: *Let us deſcribe as well as we can what an Heretick is. Every one who profeſſes to believe in Chriſt, and yet ſays there is one God of the Law and the Prophets, and another of the Goſpels,* &c. *Our Opinion muſt be the ſame concerning thoſe who have any falſe Notions of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, whether according to them, who ſay he was born of* Joſeph *and* Mary, *ſuch are the* Ebionites *and* (*a*) Valentinians; *or according to them who deny him to be the Firſt-born, the God of the whole Creation, the Word, and Wiſdom, which is the Beginning of the Ways of God, begotten before any thing was made, before the Foundation of the Worlds, before all the Hills; and who ſay that he is only Man.* Sure nothing can be clearer than theſe Words.

7. *Dionyſius*, the famous Biſhop of *Rome*, who flouriſh'd not long after *Origen*, in his Epiſtle againſt the *Sabellians*, cited by *Athanaſius*, calls the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, *the moſt venerable Doctrine of the Church of God*, which no one was in the leaſt to violate. He charges thoſe alſo, who dar'd affirm that the Son of God was a Creature, and ſomething made, not only with Hereſy, but the greateſt Blaſphemy: *It is then*, ſays (*b*) he, *no ordinary Blaſphemy, nay the greateſt, to ſay the Lord was in any reſpect made; for if the Son was made, there was a Time when he was not, but he always was.* It is certain then, that in the Days of *Dionyſius*, the Church of *Rome*, then truly the moſt honourable of all Churches, thought the Article of the Son's eternal Generation abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd; and did not hold Communion with thoſe who did not acknowledge Chriſt to be God, but affirm'd he was a Creature.

(*a*) *See* Huetius *upon* Origen's *Comment.* p. 120.
(*b*) Tomi prim. pars prim. p. 231, 232.

8. It would be endless to lay before you all the Testimonies of the Fathers to this purpose; wherefore to what has been alledg'd, I will only add this general Observation, namely, that in the first Ages there was a very great Controversy between the *Jews* and *Christians*, concerning the Person of Christ, whether he was to be God and Man, as the Prophets had foretold, or only mere Man. The *Jews* and some *Judaizing Christians* affirmed the latter, and objected the *Gentile* Polytheism to those who asserted the Divinity of Christ: The former, all the Catholick Christians strenuously defended, as the Ground of their Faith and Salvation, so as to esteem those Aliens from the Church of Christ, and Renegadoes to the Synagogue, who, tho' sound in all other respects, deny'd this Point. It seem'd indeed the very same thing to them to deny Jesus to be the Christ, as to deny him to be God.

9. When *Justin Martyr* in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, endeavoured to shew, that Christ foretold by the Prophets was God, and was to be born Man of a Virgin, *Trypho* objects thus: (*a*) *It does not only seem strange to me, but absurd, that you should say, this Christ was God, and pre-existed before Ages; then condescended to be born, being made Man, and that he was not Man of Man.* To which *Justin* replies: *I know this matter seems strange, and especially to the Men of your Nation, who are neither willing to understand, or do the things of God, but those of your own Masters, as God himself complains.* *Origen* (*b*) blames his *Epicurean*, that in personating a *Jew* he had not observ'd decorum, but put into his mouth, Words that did not agree with his Character, namely these: *My Prophet formerly propheſy'd in* Jerusalem, *that the Son of God would come a Judge of the Pious, and an Avenger of the Injust.* He then gives the Reason of this Reprehension: (*c*) *A* Jew *would not have confess'd that any Prophet said, the Son of God would come. For what they*

(*a*) *See the whole Passage at large hereafter.* (*b*) Origen *against* Celsus, p. 38. (*c*) Ibid.

say,

ſay, is, that the Chriſt of God will come. And they often diſpute with us directly concerning the Son of God, as tho' there was no ſuch Perſon nor any ſuch Prophecy. He again (*a*) upbraids *Celſus* with the ſame thing: *Nor does he know this, that the* Jews *don't at all ſay, that Chriſt will deſcend, or come into the World, as being God, or the Son of God.*

10. *Tertulian* writes (*b*) more appoſite to this Obſervation: *Now the* Jewiſh *Faith is this, ſo to believe one God, as not to own beſides him the Son, and beſides the Son the Spirit. For otherwiſe, what difference would there be between them and us? What need of the Goſpel, which is the Subſtance of the New Teſtament, and determines, that the Law and the Prophets are till* John; *unleſs from that Time the three, Father, Son and Spirit believed* [*on by us*] *exhibite to us one God? God was pleas'd to renew the Covenant with us, as that he ſhould now a-new be believed one by the Son and Spirit; as that God ſhould now be openly known in his proper Names and Perſons, who antiently being preached by the Son and Spirit, was not underſtood. Let the* Anti-Chriſts *then look to it, who deny the Father and the Son,* &c. But what *Novatian* ſays (*c*) upon that Place of *St.* John, [*Tho I teſtify of myſelf, my Teſtimony is true, becauſe I know whence I came, and whither I go. But ye know not whence I come, nor whither I go. Ye judge according to the Fleſh*] is moſt to the purpoſe, and very good: *Behold here he ſays, that he will return thither, whence he ſays he came before; He was ſent from Heaven. He deſcended then whence he came, as he goes thither, whence he deſcended. Wherefore, if Chriſt had only been a Man, he had not come thence* (*d*); *but by coming from whence Man can't come, he ſhews himſelf to have been God, who came. Now the* Jews, *ignorant and not appriz'd of this his Deſcent, made theſe Men their Heirs in the Hereſy; to whom it is ſaid, You know not whence I come, nor*

(*a*) P. 162. (*b*) P. 518. (*c*) Novatian. c. 23.

(*d*) *Theſe Words are omitted in the Biſhop's Citation:* And conſequently had not gone thither, becauſe he did not come from thence.

whither I go: You judge according to the Flesh. The Jews, *as well as they, held only the Carnal Nativity of Christ, and believed Christ to be nothing else but Man; not considering, that, as Man could not come from Heaven, so as to challenge a Return thither, he must be God, who descended thence, whence Man could not come.*

11. In this respect the Author (whoever he was) of the Epistle to *Hero* the Deacon, ascribed to *Ignatius*, is worthy Notice, because he condemns their Heresy, who deny the Divinity of Christ, as a *Jewish* Impiety and Blasphemy. These are his Words: (*a*) *If any one says the Lord is a mere Man, he is a* Jew, *a Murderer of Christ.* The same Author, probably, has Words much to the same purpose in the Epistle to the *Antiochians*, where he exhorts them (*b*) *to throw off all* Jewish *and* Gentile *Error; and neither to introduce a multitude of Gods, nor under the pretence of one God to deny Christ.* And a little after he adds: *Whosoever then preaches one only God, so as to destroy the Divinity of Christ,* (*c*) *is the Devil, and an Enemy of all Righteousness.*

12. Lastly the great *Athanasius* has (according to custom) excellently express'd the Sense of the Primitive Catholick Church in this Point: The *Jews*, says (*d*) he, *have a great deal to say against Idolaters, and justly, accusing them of Worshipping the Creature besides the Creator. But tho' they blame this Impiety, they are not therefore Pious, when they deny the Son of God, by whom all things were made, and charge us with Polytheism for Worshipping the Father by him. We therefore came out of, and are separate from the* Gentiles, *that we might not be engaged in their impure Idolatries; and we also are come out of the Blasphemy of the* Jews, *confessing the Son of God.* A little after: (*e*) *We differ from the* Judaizers, *who corrupt Christianity with* Judaism, *and denying him who is God of God, affirm, as the* Jews *do, that there is one God;*

(*a*) Tom. 2. *P. A.* p. 114. (*b*) Ibid. p. 109, *and* 110. (*c*) *Or a* Calumniator, *as the old Version seems to render* Filius Diaboli. (*d*) Tom. Sec. p. 37. (*e*) Ibid.

not

not therefore saying that he is the only God, as he is only unbegotten, only the Fountain of the Deity; but as being without a Son, a living Word and Wisdom. What follows in *Athanasius* is very well worth reading, namely, what he [Excellent Man] says from ver. 1. of Chap. 1. of St. *John*, and from Reason, to prove it impossible God should be rightly conceiv'd One in the Sense of the *Jews*, and *Judaizing Hereticks, i. e.* that he should only be one Person; whereas it is necessary, that God, who is an eternal Mind, should have in and with him his Word, not such as the Human, but a Living and Subsisting Word, and therefore a Person: and as this Word is from God the Father, therefore a Divine Person distinct from the Father; and yet because the Word is in the Father, and the Father's Word, therefore one God with the Father. But these things belong to another Head.

13. Before I conclude this Head, it may be useful to take a transient View of the *Jews* Notion concerning their *Messiah*. Now, it is observable, that their Prophets, have in many Places plainly signify'd, that the *Messiah* was to be God and Man together, as is largely shewn by (*a*) *Justin Martyr* among the Antients. The Noble and Learned (*b*) *Du Plessis* hath fully proved, that the more understanding part of the *Hebrew* Doctors were not altogether ignorant of it. However, it is certain that the generality of the *Jews*, even in our Saviour's time, had but a mean and low Notion of their *Messiah*, thinking him to be no more than a Man. Thus we *read* (*c*) the Holy Jesus caught the captious *Jews* by this Question; *What think you of Christ? Whose Son is he?* For when they answer'd; *The Son of David*, (for they expected a *Messiah*, who should be merely the Son of *David*, not dreaming of the Son of God) our Saviour urg'd them with this

(*a*) *See the Dialogue with* Trypho. (*b*) *Of the true Christian Religion*, Ch. 28. (*c*) *Matt.* Ch. 22. v. 42.

further

further difficult Queſtion, *How then doth* David *by the Spirit call him Lord, ſaying, The Lord ſaid unto my Lord? If then* David *call him Lord, how is he his Son?* This gravell'd the *Phariſees*, which, upon ſuppoſition that they had a Notion of Chriſt's Divinity, would have been eaſily anſwer'd. They might have ſaid, that Chriſt indeed was to be the Son of *David* according to the Fleſh; but his Lord, with reſpect to his Divine Nature.

This Notion of the *Jews* had its Original doubtleſs from their groſs and carnal Conceptions of the *Meſſiah*. They expected he ſhould be a glorious King, Rich and Powerful, ſo as to exalt their Sceptre and Nation above all the Empires of the World; that he ſhould ſubdue all the Enemies of his People, and having laid the Empreſs of the Earth, haughty *Rome*, in Ruins, ſhould advance *Jeruſalem* to her Metropolitical Dignity. What occaſion had ſuch a *Meſſiah* for Divinity? All theſe things a *Cyrus*, an *Alexander*, or a *Cæſar*, with the Divine Providence, might have accompliſh'd: Not to ſay, that ſuch an Earthly Kingdom would have been abſolutely unworthy of God. No wonder then, if the *Jews* thus thinking of their *Meſſiah*, never acknowledg'd his Divine Nature.

14. But that there are, or ever were Men of ſuch Notions among the Chriſtians, who have been clearly taught in the Goſpel things much more Holy and Sublime of their Chriſt, is exceeding ſtrange indeed. To ſay nothing of thoſe Places in the Old Teſtament, which immediately reſpect his Divinity, in which he is proclaimed the Son of God, and God before Ages, by whom all things were made (Places ſo many and ſo plain, that he muſt be wilfully blind, who does not ſee them) even thoſe Places, which ſpeak of the Œconomy, which relate to his Office or Honour, as he is our *Meſſiah* and *Mediator*, they certainly ſpeak of ſomething more than a Man, or a Creature. His Œconomy neceſſarily ſuppoſes, and even determines his Divinity. For the Holy Scriptures preach to us, and we profeſs

to

to believe them, ſuch a Chriſt, as is the Saviour of our Souls, as is to us Wiſdom, Juſtice, Sanctification and Redemption, *i. e.* as makes us Wiſe, Juſt, Holy and at laſt perfectly Bleſſed; as immediately hears the Prayers of thoſe who every where call upon his Holy Name, and therefore is every where, knows all things, even the Heart; as is always with his Church diſperſed over the World, and ſo protects and defends it with his Almighty Power, as that neither the Powers of the Earth, nor the Gates of Hell ſhall prevail againſt it; as is of equal Majeſty with God the Father, and to be adored with Divine Worſhip, not only by us humble Mortals, but by Angels, Arch-Angels, and all the Super-celeſtial World; as, laſtly, ſhall come in the end of the World, ſhining in the brighteſt Glory, and guarded with Miniſtring Angels, to judge the World, to bring into open light, not only the Deeds of all Men, but the Secrets of their Hearts, to baniſh his Enemies into Hell, and to beſtow upon his Servants not Riches, or Honours, or Earthly Pleaſures, but Heavenly Glory, and eternal Life. Are theſe things compatible with mere Man, or any Creature? I muſt ſay, he that thinks ſo, ſets himſelf not only againſt Faith, but Reaſon alſo.

This by way of Digreſſion. To return; I ſuppoſe I have confuted the raſh Aſſertion of *Epiſcopius*, by ſufficient Teſtimonies of the Antients: I therefore proceed to the ſecond Head. (*a*)

(*a*) *See the remarkable Paſſage of St.* Cyprian *to the ſame purpoſe with the other Antients cited in this Chapter,* Def. *N. C.* Sect. 2. Ch. 10. §. 2.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of those who in the First Age of Christianity opposed the Doctrine of the Gospel, concerning Christ's being God and Man.

WE come now to Ecclesiastical History, which whosoever will consult, must wonder, I doubt not, with what face *Episcopius* could affirm, That in the Primitive Churches, from the Apostles times, for three entire Centuries, *the Faith and Profession of this special Manner of Jesus Christ's Filiation* (in which he is defined the Son of God, and God before all Ages) *was not judged necessary to Salvation.* For nothing can be more repugnant to all Church-History. In order to make this clear, I must repeat that Caution I gave in the Beginning of this Dissertation, namely, that the Primitive Church could not by any other better way declare her Judgment, concerning the Necessity of Believing any Article of our Religion, than by Excommunicating those who deny'd it. The Anathema of the Church, as *Tertullian* speaks, was formerly held by all Christians, *for the greatest Presumption of the future Judgment.* And thus the Persons Excommunicate, those whom the Church had thrown out of her Pale, till they repented, and desired the Peace of the Church, were esteemed out of the State of Salvation, according to that old Saying, *Out of the Church no Salvation.* This indeed *Episcopius* by stating this Question, [*Whether that fifth Manner of the Filiation of Jesus Christ be necessary to be known and believed to Salvation, and whether they who deny it, are liable to Excommunication*] plainly confesses; namely, that to excommunicate any Person for denying any Doctrine, is the same, as to judge and pronounce that Doctrine necessary to be known and believed to Salvation. If then the Primitive Churches

ex-

excommunicated thoſe, who denied this fifth Manner of Chriſt's Filiation; then, according to *Epiſcopius* himſelf, they are to be thought the Aſſerters of that Manner, as neceſſary to Salvation. But it is very plain from Church-Hiſtory, that for the three firſt Centuries, no one deny'd that Manner of Chriſt's Filiation, in which he was God, begotten of God before all Ages, who was not anathematiz'd, and excluded the Communion of the Church, as a Foreigner, an Alien from Chriſt's Body, unleſs he ſpeedily retracted and condemn'd his Hereſy. Therefore, *&c.* which was the Thing to be demonſtrated.

2. *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, who lived in the Days of the Apoſtles, were the Firſt who diſturb'd the Church with this Hereſy. This only difference there was betwixt their reſpective Opinions, concerning the Lord Jeſus, That *Cerinthus* ſeparated Jeſus from Chriſt, and made Jeſus a mere Man, the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary*, into whom Chriſt deſcended from above after his Baptiſm, and retired from him at his Paſſion, and return'd to his Pleroma, or Complement; but *Ebion* (for we ſhall ſhew this to be the Name of a Man hereafter, notwithſtanding the contrary Sentiment of ſome learned Men) affirmed, that Jeſus and Chriſt was the ſame, the Son of *Joſeph* and *Mary*, and from the Beginning to the End of his Life only mere Man. This difference we learn from *Irenæus*: (*a*) *One* Cerinthus *an* Aſiatick *taught, that the World was not made by the Supreme God, but by a Power ſeparate and very diſtant from that Principality which is over all, and ignorant of that God who is over all. He added, that Jeſus was not born of a Virgin (for that ſeem'd impoſſible to him) but that he was the Son of* Joſeph *and* Mary, *like other Men; and excelled all others in Juſtice, Prudence and Wiſdom; that Chriſt after his Baptiſm deſcended into him in the ſhape of a Dove, from that Principality, which is over all; that he then preach'd the unknown Father, work'd Miracles, and*

(*a*) Lib. 1. Ch. 25. pag. 126.

at

at last flew back from Jesus; that Jesus suffer'd and rose again, but that Christ remain'd impassible, being Spiritual. Again he thus speaks of the *Ebionites*; (*a*) *Those that are called* Ebionites *are unanimous, that the World was made by God, and differ also from* Cerinthus *and* Carpocrates *concerning our Lord.* Here if we follow the received Reading, *Irenæus* plainly makes two differences between the Tenets of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, one concerning the Creation of the World, or God the Creator, and another concerning our Lord Jesus. *Cerinthus* would have it, that the World was not made by the Supreme God, but some inferior Power; but the *Ebionites* confessed, that the World was made by God, the Supreme Principle of all Things. Again, *Cerinthus* taught, that Christ (I know not who) descended from that Supreme Principality, which is above the Creator of the World, into Jesus for a Time, after his Baptism; but the *Ebionites* own no such Principality, nor any Christ who came into Jesus from that Principality. But if you'll alter the Reading, and with a very (*b*) learned Man put [*Consimiliter* instead of *Nonsimiliter*] then the Sense of *Irenæus* will be, that the *Ebionites* thus far agreed with *Cerinthus*, as to teach, that Jesus was a mere Man born of *Joseph* and *Mary* (as *Irenæus* also testifies in other Places cited by us) tho they rejected that other Fiction concerning a certain Christ. And indeed how could they receive that Fancy of a Christ descending into Jesus from the Principality, which is above the Creator of the World, who taught that the World was created by the supreme God? This *Tertullian* also expressly testifies in these Words: Ebion *succeeded* Cerinthus, *though not in all respects concurring with him, in that he says the World was made by God, not by Angels.* Thus *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* concerning the first *Ebionites*. Afterwards there arose two sorts of *Ebionites*, one who denied both the

(*a*) P. 127. Ch. 26. Lib. 1. (*b*) *Bishop* Pearson, Vind. Ignat. part 2. C. 2. p. 351. *Ed.* P. Ap. Vol. 2.

Divinity

Divinity of our Lord, and his Nativity of the Virgin; another who, though they denied Christ to be God, confess'd, as the Catholicks do, that he was conceiv'd by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin *Mary*. Of these we shall speak hereafter.

3. Now, as for the common Tenet of *Ebion* and *Cerinthus*, namely, That our Saviour Jesus was a mere Man, not the true Son of God, born of God the Father before all Ages; how execrable it seem'd to the Apostolical and the next succeeding Church; how the Teachers of it were esteem'd Aliens from the Church of Christ, and consequently from Salvation by Christ, in the first Ages; I have clearly shew'd already, from the Writings of *Ignatius* and *Irenæus*. To them I must add what (*a*) *Jerome* gives us from the Monuments of the Antients, That the Apostle St. *John* wrote his Gospel upon the Request of the *Asian Bishops*, against *Cerinthus* and other Hereticks, and especially against the rising Doctrine of the *Ebionites*, who asserted, that Christ was not before *Mary*. As for *Cerinthus*, *Irenæus* agrees with *Jerome*, where he expressly (*b*) writes, that the Apostle St. *John* intended by his Gospel to root out the Error which *Cerinthus* had propagated. Hence we may gather, that the Bishops of *Asia*, namely, of those Parts where *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* first taught, as soon as they had found that those Hereticks had broke in upon, or rather crept into their Churches, immediately calling a Council, as it became good Shepherds, against the Devourers of Christ's Flock (as *Eusebius* (*c*) speaks concerning the Synod of *Antioch*, assembled against *Paul* of *Samosata*) met together, and mutually entring into Measures for the speedy Suppression of the growing Heresies, immediately implor'd the Aid and Assistance of the Apostle St. *John*, then alive, who, upon that occasion, as well as to supply the Defects of the for-

(*a*) Catalogus Scriptor. Eccles. in Joann. (*b*) Lib. 3. cap. 11. p. 257. (*c*) E. H. Lib. 7. cap. 27. p. 226.

mer

mer Evangeliſts, wrote his Goſpel; in the beginning of which, by his Apoſtolical Authority, he check'd the Madneſs of *Cerinthus*, *Ebion*, and other Hereticks, (as *Irenæus* ſays in the Place laſt cited) and made up the Canon of Truth, which afterwards prevail'd in the Church.

4. And indeed, whoſoever, but indifferently skill'd in the Hereſiology of the firſt Age, ſhall attentively read the beginning of St. *John*'s Goſpel, muſt immediately perceive that the Apoſtle particularly mark'd out all thoſe Hereticks, and by his Apoſtolical Power confuted their impious Tenets. He aſſerts the Divine Nature of our Lord againſt *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, *v.* 1. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* The Word was in the Beginning, much more then, before *Joſeph* and *Mary*; and it was God, therefore not only mere Man. The Evangeliſt has an Eye to the Doctrine of *Cerinthus*, and other Hereticks, concerning the Creation of the World, *ver.* 3. *All things were made by him*, [the Word.] Thoſe Hereticks ſaid, as we have before obſerv'd, that this World was made by inferior Powers, far remov'd from, altogether foreign to, and unaſſiſted by the ſupreme God. On the other hand, the Evangeliſt teaches, that *all things were made by the Word, which was with God, and was God.* In the ſame Verſe, he adds againſt the ſame Hereticks, *And without him was nothing made that was made.* Whoſoever does not attend to the Apoſtle's Deſign, can ſee nothing in theſe Words but vain Tautology. Now thoſe Hereticks, (as *Grotius* has well obſerv'd) would have it, that there was one Maker of this viſible World, but that there were other Makers of the inviſible things, and that each Pleroma, or Complement, had its own Maker. St. *John* therefore ſays, that every thing which was made, was made by the Word. The Evangeliſt plainly aims at theſe ſame Hereticks again, *ver.* 10, & 11. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not. He came to his own,*

and

and his own receiv'd him not. It was the known Opinion of *Cerinthus* and all the other Hereticks, who distinguish'd betwixt the *supreme God*, and the Maker of this World, that our Saviour Christ came into this World from the supreme Principality, as into the Creation of another, with this Intent, that he might redeem Man from the Dominion and Slavery of the Maker of the World, into I know not what Liberty, or rather Licentiousness. In opposition to these Men, the Apostle teaches, that the Word or Son of God, our Saviour, came down from his Father into this World, as into his own House and Creation, with this Design, as it presently follows, *ver.* 12, & 13. That he might assert those who receiv'd him, into the true Liberty and Adoption of the Sons of God; tho' ungrateful Man, for the generality, did not acknowledge him as their Creator and Redeemer. I'm fully persuaded, this was the true and genuine Sense of the Apostle in those Words. Thus also (*a*) *Irenæus* understood them, where he makes this Note: *According to* Marcion, *and the Men of his Strain*, (namely, *Cerinthus*, and the other Forerunners of *Marcion*, whom (*b*) *Tertullian* calls the *early* and abortive *Marcionites*) *the World was not made by him, nor did he come to his own, but another's.* Thus, *he says*, (*c*) that St. *John*, in the beginning of his Gospel, does manifestly shew to all that will hear, *i. e.* that have Ears, that there is one God the Father over all, and one Word of God, who is through all, by whom all things were made; that this World is properly his, and made by him at the Will of the Father, and not by Angels, nor by Apostacy, Defection, or Ignorance, *&c.* Further, the Apostle teaches against the *Simonians*, *Saturninians*, and the other *Docetæ*, that the Word or Son of God was really incarnate, and made Man; *v.* 14. *The Word was made*

(*a*) Lib. 3. chap. 11. p. 257. *See also* Novatian, chap. 14.
(*b*) Lib. 3. chap. 8. p. 401. (*c*) Lib. 5. chap. 18. p. 463.

Flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, as of the only begotten of the Father, &c. Nay, in this one Sentence, he hath concluded all the Hereticks of his Age; for, as *Irenæus* has truly said in the Place often cited before, none of the Hereticks thought that the Word was made Flesh. All the Hereticks who had false Notions of the Person of Christ (as we have before observ'd) may be divided into two Classes: One, of the *Phantasiastæ*, who plainly acknowledging the Divinity in our Saviour, denied his human Nature, supposing the Conjunction of the Human Nature absolutely unbecoming the Divine Majesty. Of these *Novatian* writes excellently. *(a) There are other Hereticks so rigid for the Divinity of Christ, as to say that he was not incarnate, as to take from him all that Humanity which he took upon himself, lest they should dilute the Power of the Divinity, by joining to it* (as they suppos'd) *the Human Nature. This we don't approve, but however argue from it, (b) That Christ was so far God, that some, taking away his Humanity, thought him to be Only God.* On the other hand, another Class of Hereticks only own'd the Human Nature in Christ, namely, the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*. It is but too plain on both sides, that it was denied that the Word was made Flesh, that is, that Christ was God and Man. Lastly, The Heresy in common to *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* concerning the Observation of the *Mosaical* Law, as necessary to Salvation, is (as *Grotius* has observ'd) transiently confuted by the Apostle, *ver.* 17. *The Law was given by* Moses, *but Grace and Truth by Jesus Christ.*

5. Moreover, the holy Apostle plainly censures the same Hereticks in his first Epistle also, and calls them all by that one Name of Anti-Christs, as *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and others of the Antients have observ'd. The beginning of the Epistle exactly tallies with the beginning of his Gospel; for in them both, the Divine lays

(*a*) Page 718.
(*b*) *So* Tertullian *against* Marcion, Lib. 3. cap. 8.

open

open and explains the great Myſtery of Godlineſs, God manifeſt in the Fleſh; very pompouſly unfolding both the Divinity and Oeconomy of our Saviour. We have ſhewn it in the Goſpel already; now the Epiſtle begins thus: *That which was from the Beginning, which we have heard, which we have ſeen with our Eyes, and our Hands have handled of the Word of Life, (for the Life was made manifeſt, and we ſaw it, and teſtify of it, and tell unto you that* eternal Life *which was with the Father, and was made manifeſt to us) What we have ſeen and heard, that do we relate to you,* &c. Here St. *John* affirms againſt the *Docetæ*, who denied that our Saviour was real Man, that he and the reſt of the Apoſtles heard the Word of Life, or the enlivening Word, and ſaw him with their Eyes, handled him with their Hands: here he calls in all the proper Senſes to give Teſtimony of his Incarnation. Againſt thoſe who affirm'd the Lord Jeſus to be meer Man, the Apoſtle teaches that the Word was from the Beginning, namely, of the *Creation*, and therefore did not begin to exiſt when born of *Mary*. Againſt the ſame Perſons he aſſerts in like manner, that the Life, the eternal Life, *the Word*, was firſt with the Father, *with God*; but afterwards, having taken upon him Fleſh, was made manifeſt to Men. This is the plain, clear Senſe of the Place; and thus, as (*a*) *Tertullian* tells us, it was receiv'd in the primitive Church: But that novel Interpretation of theirs, who expound the [Word of Life] by the Goſpel, or Doctrine of Life immortal, is indeed very abſurd. To ſay no more againſt it, what pretty Senſe is this, that the Apoſtles not only heard the Goſpel, but ſaw it with their very Eyes, and handled it with their Hands? The Great Man (*b*) *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* hath formerly obſerv'd the Agreement of the beginning of St. *John*'s Goſpel with that of this firſt Epiſtle of his,

(*a*) Pag. 508 and 509.
(*b*) Euſeb. E. H. p. 224, &c. Lib. 7. chap. 25.

in these Words: *The Gospel and the Epistle answer each other, and begin alike:* The one says, *In the Beginning was the Word*; the other, *That which was from the Beginning:* The one, *The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, as of the Only-begotten of the Father*: The other has the same thing, in somewhat other Words, *What we have heard, what we have seen with our Eyes; what we have seen, and our Hands have handled, of the Word of Life*; and *the Life was made manifest.* For he * *premises* these things, intending them, (as he shows afterwards) against those who denied that Christ was come in the Flesh. Upon this account he adds, *And what we have seen, we testify, and preach unto you that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was made manifest to us. What we have seen and heard, we preach unto you. Here he insists, and recedes not from what he had propounded.*

6. In the second Chapter of the same Epistle, after the Apostle had told the Faithful that there were then many Anti-christs, and that they came forth from the Bosom of the Church, *ver.* 18, and 19, (now he calls the Hereticks who spread false and impious Doctrines concerning the Person of Christ, Anti-Christs) he paints some of them in their proper Colours, *ver.* 22, and 23. *Who is a Lyar, but he that denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is Anti-Christ, who denies the Father and the Son; Every one that denies the Son, hath not the Father.* Among the Hereticks of the first Age, there were some, who falsly took upon them the Christian Name, (which may seem strange) and yet denied Jesus to be the Christ. Thus the *Cerinthians*, as we shew'd in the beginning of this Chapter, from *Irenæus*, separated Jesus from Christ, and taught that Jesus was one, and Christ another. Hence (*a*) *Epiphanius*, upon the *Cerinthian* Heresy, expressly testifies that they taught that Jesus was not the Christ. These Words

* *I could not think it necessary to preserve the musical Allusion in the Words* Προανακρουεται & ἐπιμελῶς.

(*a*) Hæresis 28.

of

of St. *John*, *Who is a Lyar, but he that denies that Jesus is the Christ?* were directed against these Hereticks; as also those other Words, *chap.* 5. *ver.* 1. *Every one that believes Jesus is the Christ, is born of God.* Thus that best Interpreter of St. *John*, (*b*) *Irenæus* teaches us; and indeed you can no where find any other, to whom they are more suitable. For it is very plain, from the Context, that the Apostle does not speak of the profess'd Enemies of our Religion, who denied Jesus to be the Christ foretold by the Prophets, and said we were to expect another; but of the false Prophets and Deceivers, under the Mask of Christianity. The following Words of the Apostle [*This is Anti-Christ, he that denies the Father and the Son. Every one, who denies the Son, hath not the Father*] manifestly strike at the common Heresy of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion.* Both of them absolutely denied that Jesus was the true Son of God, born of God the Father before *Mary*, and even before the Creation; and therefore, by the Apostle's Judgment, did not really confess God the Father; because since the Gospel was revealed, no Man can believe in and worship God the Father as he ought, but he who also holds God the Son.

7. Again, in the fourth Chapter of this Epistle, *ver* 1. the Apostle guards the Christians against the Hereticks of his time, in these Words: *Beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they are of God; for many false Prophets are gone out into the World.* In the Verses following, *ver.* 2, and 3, he proposes two Marks, by which these false Prophets may be known, one of which plainly belongs to the *Docetæ*, the other to the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites: By this know ye the Spirit of God, every Spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is of God; but every Spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is not of God: This is the Spirit of Anti-Christ, which ye have heard should come into the World, and which is now in the*

(*a*) Lib. 3. chap. 18. p. 278.

World. Upon which Place of the Apoſtle, we have a very *credible Interpreter*, namely *Polycarp*, the Diſciple of St. *John*, who, in his Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, cites the latter part of it, and expreſly expounds it, not of the open Enemies of Chriſtianity, who denied that Jeſus was the true Meſſiah, becauſe he was come in the Fleſh, *i. e.* in an humble Condition, (as *Grotius* miſtakes the Apoſtle;) but of the Hereticks, who profeſs'd Chriſtianity. For after that the Apoſtolical Man had exhorted the *Philippians* to ſerve Jeſus Chriſt with all Fear and Reverence, he adds immediately: (*a*) *Being Followers of that which is good, keeping off from Offences, and falſe Brethren, and hypocritical Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, who deceive vain Men; For every one, who does not confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh, is Anti-Chriſt; and whoſoever does not confeſs the Teſtimony or Martyrdom of the Croſs, is of the Devil.* Therefore they were falſe Brethren, and Pretenders to the Name of Chriſt, who denied that Jeſus Chriſt was come in the Fleſh. This alſo is very plain from the Deſign of the Apoſtle, who gives the Marks and Tokens, by which the Faithful might diſtinguiſh falſe Prophets from orthodox Teachers. What need of Tokens to diſtinguiſh the open and profeſs'd Enemies of Chriſtianity? But who thoſe Hereticks were, who, profeſſing Chriſtianity, denied that Jeſus Chriſt was come in the Fleſh, we have ſeveral times told you; namely, *Menander*, *Saturninus*, and the other *Docetæ*, (whoſe Hereſy *Marcion* revived, when *Polycarp* wrote theſe things) abſolutely denied that our Lord was come into this World in human Fleſh, or really ſuffer'd and was crucify'd; and even (as *Polycarp* ſpeaks) in no wiſe confeſs'd the Martyrdom of the Croſs.

8. This Hereſy (*b*) *Ignatius*, the other Diſciple and Acquaintance of St. *John*, every where confutes in his Epiſtles, eſpecially in that to the *Smyrneans*, which

(*a*) Vol. 2. P. A. p. 186 *and* 187.
(*b*) Pag. 36. Vol. 2. P. Ap.

is

is almoſt wholly levell'd againſt this pernicious Doctrine. *What*, ſays he, *ſhall any one profit me, who praiſes me, and blaſphemes my Lord, not confeſſing him incarnate. Whoſoever does not aſſert this, perfectly denies him, and is in a State of Death.* Here every one may ſee that this of *Ignatius*, not to confeſs the Lord incarnate, is altogether the ſame with that of St. *John*, not to confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the Fleſh. A little before, in the ſame Epiſtle, *Ignatius* (*a*) had thus explain'd the Hereſy of the *Docetæ*, as oppoſite to the Catholick Doctrine: *But he truly ſuffer'd, and really rais'd himſelf, not as ſome Infidels ſay, only ſuffer'd in Appearance, themſelves only being* [*Chriſtians*] *in Appearance.* The Senſe is, that they who teach that our Lord was only made Man, and only ſuffer'd in Appearance, are themſelves only to be accounted Chriſtians in Appearance. Afterwards he refutes thoſe fantaſtical Hereticks, from the remarkable Hiſtory of Jeſus, ſhewing his Body, and ſuffering the Wounds upon it to be handled by his Diſciples, after his Reſurrection, and eſpecially by *Thomas*. Upon this Hiſtory, he makes this Remark: (*b*) *Straightly they touch'd him, and being convinc'd by his Fleſh and Spirit, i. e.* convinc'd by that Experiment, they believ'd our Lord to be true Man and true God. For *Spirit*, as we have ſhewn before, in Chriſt, denotes among the Writers of the firſt Age the divine Nature of Chriſt, eſpecially where it is oppoſed to Fleſh. *Ignatius* here manifeſtly alludes to *Thomas*'s Confeſſion, who, upon ſeeing and handling the Wounds of Chriſt, broke out into theſe Words, *My Lord and my God!* A little after, (*c*) the holy Man calls them Brutes in the Shape of Men, meaning, that they who taught contrary to the plain Truth, that our Lord was only Man in Appearance, were not worthy to be thought reaſonable Men, but Brutes in human Shape. Laſtly, he obſerves (*d*) of them, that they wholly abſtain'd from the Lord's

(*a*) Pag. 34. (*b*) P. 34, & 35. (*c*) P. 36. (*d*) P. 37.

Supper, as not confeſſing that the Euchariſt was the Fleſh of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who ſuffer'd for our Sins; that is, they did not believe our Lord to have been true Man, and really to have ſuffer'd upon the Croſs, (which *Polycarp* expreſſes, to confeſs the Martyrdom of the Croſs) and therefore they would not celebrate the Memory of his Paſſion. Theſe plain Teſtimonies of the two Diſciples of St. *John*, don't ſuffer us to doubt, whether the Falſe Prophets and Anti-Chriſts, ſaid by the Apoſtle to have denied that Chriſt came in the Fleſh, were any other than *Menander*, *Saturninus*, *Baſilides*, and the other Phantaſticals of the firſt Age. Moreover, after *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and almoſt all the Antients near the Apoſtolical Age, have obſerv'd, that the Apoſtle, in this place, intended to cenſure thoſe Men.

9. To proceed with our Apoſtle, after ſome things in the ſame Chapter, he characterizes another Hereſy concerning the Perſon of Chriſt, contrary to that of the *Docetæ*, *ver.* 15. *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.* The oppoſite Member, expreſs'd in the former Obſervation, is underſtood here: But whoſoever ſhall not confeſs that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth not in him, nor he in God. Now it is not to be doubted, but that the Apoſtle demands in theſe Words the Confeſſion of that Son of God, whom he had before preach'd in this Epiſtle in part, and whom he more fully declares in his Goſpel, namely, of the Son of God, who is the Word of God the Father, *who was in the Beginning, was with God, and was God, by whom all things were made*, &c. By theſe Characters, the Adverſaries with whom we have now to do, deny not that the true and proper Son of God, born of God the Father, before all Ages, is denoted; nay, it is clear to all who will ſee, when they may. But *Cerinthus* did not confeſs our Jeſus to be ſuch a Son of God, nor *Ebion* after him; both of them teaching, that

that Jesus was a mere Man, not existing before *Mary*; both of them therefore, in the Apostle's Judgment, were Aliens from God. Now because *Cerinthianism* was then the most growing Heresy, the Apostle every where urges, inculcates, and commends that Faith, by which we believe Jesus to be the Son of God (*a*). These Tokens, given in the second and fourth Chapter of this Epistle, were sufficient for the Faithful of the Apostolical Age to discover all who were Heterodox concerning the Person of our Saviour. This is the Sum of them, That every Teacher, who confess'd that one Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, was really made Man for Man's Salvation, was of God, (namely, with respect to that Doctrine, as *Estius* well observes) but on the other hand, that whoever does not confess this, is to be deemed a False Prophet, and an Anti-Christ. But the Apostle chiefly insists upon these Tokens to mark out Hereticks, who denied our Saviour to be true God, or true Man. Thus *Tertullian* (*b*): [*John*] *does especially call those Anti-Christs in his Epistle, who denied that Christ was come in the Flesh, and who did not think that Jesus was the Son of God:* Marcion *was of that Opinion,* (*and before him,* Menander, Saturninus, *and others*;) Ebion *was of that Opinion also.* I have been the longer upon this, because it may hence appear not only from the Monuments of the most antient Fathers, but from the Apostolical Writings, that there were some in the Age of the Apostles, who denied the Divinity of our Lord, and who were upon that account esteem'd by the Apostles Hereticks, and even Anti-Christs, (far from Brethren, and true Members of the Church.) Further, it is hence very plain, that as the Doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation, his being truly God, and truly Man, was variously oppos'd by various Hereticks; so it was the most studiously guarded and pre-

(*a*) Cap. 3. ver. 23, 5. ver. 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20. (*b*) P. 214.

serv'd

ſerv'd by all true Paſtors of the Church, as the Ground and Perfection of the Chriſtian Faith.

10. I ſhould here have concluded what I deſign'd concerning the Hereticks of the firſt Age, who denied our Lord's Divinity, namely, the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*, but that I can't paſs over the ſtrange Comment of an (*a*) *impious Author*, upon the *Ebionites*: for if what he ſtrenuouſly contends to prove, be true, there is no occaſion to aſſert the Neceſſity, or even defend the Truth of our Lord's Divinity; and the *Ebionites*, at leaſt thoſe of latter Date, were ſo far from being Hereticks, that we muſt eſteem them the only faithful Keepers of the Apoſtolical Doctrine and Tradition concerning Chriſt. He boldly affirms, that the *Ebionites* (who confeſs'd Chriſt born of the Virgin, but denied him to be God) were no other than the *Nazarenes*, or the firſt and moſt antient Chriſtians of *Jeruſalem*, who, after they had receiv'd the Faith of Chriſt, retain'd the Obſervation of the Law, and religiouſly preſerv'd the Doctrine of our Saviour's mere Humanity, which, forſooth! they had been taught by the Apoſtles; their Church continuing to the Times of *Adrian*, by whom they were driven out of their own Country, call'd in Contempt *Ebionites*, and accounted Hereticks by the reſt of the Chriſtians. The vain Man pleaſes himſelf mightily with this Device, and greatly glories in it, as a Tradition far more antient and certain than all the Traditions of the Catholicks concerning the Son's Divinity.

11. From what we have ſaid before, it is plain this is an abominable impudent Fiction. For to ſay nothing of the Scripture cited by us, what Apoſtolical Writer ever heard of it? Which of them has not given in his Teſtimony to the contrary? And how eaſily is this boaſted Tradition to be refuted from Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory? *Euſebius* (*b*) expreſly witneſſeth, that he had learn'd from the Antients, that all the fifteen

(*a*) Zuicker, *in his* Irenicum Irenicorum. (*b*) Lib. 4. chap. 5. p. 95.

Biſhops

Bishops who presided over the Church of *Jerusalem* till the Times of *Adrian*, held the Knowledge of Christ pure and sincere: *I could no where find how long those Bishops sat in particular, who presided over* Jerusalem. *It is said they all sat but a short Time. But this I have learn'd from the Antient Monuments, that till the Time of the Siege under* Adrian, *there were fifteen in a continued Succession, all of them originally* Hebrews, *and who had received the genuine Knowledge of Christ.* Now *Eusebius* would never have said this of them, if he had been informed by the Antients, that they were *Ebionites*; a sort of Men, which he charges with Impiety, for denying Christ to be God the Word before Ages, and pronounces to be brought under the Power of the Devil. For thus he writes concerning both sorts of the *Ebionites*: (*a*) *But others, whom the malignant Spirit could not absolutely move from the Christian Religion, finding their weak-side, he hath brought under his own Power. These the Antients called* Ebionites, *because they thought meanly and lowly of Christ. They said he was a mere common Man, and nothing else, was justified by a Proficiency in Virtue, and begotten of* Mary, *as other Men are. Moreover, they held the Observation of the Law to be absolutely necessary, as tho Salvation was not to be obtained by the Faith of Christ only, and a Life led according to it. There was another sort under the same Name, who rejected the absurd Notion of their Predecessors, and did not deny that Christ was begotten of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit; but these also were engaged in the Impiety of those before them, not confessing his Pre-existence as God the Word and Wisdom, and also especially being equally zealous Followers of the Corporeal Worship of the Law.* Surely from these two Places of (*b*) *Eusebius* collated, it is very clear that the later *Ebionites* (whom *Nicephorus* calls the Less) were in two respects different from the first Christians of *Jerusalem.* (1.) They had impious Notions of Christ, not confessing him to be God, the Word and Wisdom, and to have subsisted

(*a*) Lib. 3. chap. 27. p. 79. (*b*) Eccl. Hist. Lib. 13. chap. 13.

before

before the Nativity of his Flesh; but the first Christians of *Jerusalem* embrac'd the genuine Knowledge of Christ. (2.) They insisted upon the *Mosaical* Rites, as absolutely necessary to be observed, and denied that the Faith of Christ was sufficient without them. This *Eusebius* expresly observes of the former *Ebionites*, and also affirms of the later, that they as well as the other were Admirers of the *Mosaical Law*; and even in this plainly signifies, that some part of their Impiety consisted. The Sense of *Eusebius* is plainly this, that those *Ebionites* had added to their former deadly Error, in which they denied Christ to be God, that other pernicious one, of the Necessity of *Moses*'s Law, and therefore were upon two accounts impious, and out of the Means of Salvation. But though the Christians of *Jerusalem* observed Circumcision, and other *Mosaical* Rites, (according to that Concession the Apostles made to their Infirmity) *Eusebius* never charges them with Impiety for it; because they both had a right Notion of Christ, and did not require the *Mosaical* Observations at the hands of the *Gentile* Christians. Indeed, if they had done this, they had plainly opposed the Decree of the Council of *Jerusalem*, in which *James*, the first Bishop of that See, presided. There is no doubt but that *Eusebius* thought those Christians of *Jerusalem* culpable, those especially who lived after the Destruction of the Temple by *Titus*, in that they did not at length perceive that the Ritual Worship, prescrib'd by *Moses*, was entirely abolish'd: But he therefore praises them, because they did not obtrude those legal Rites they observ'd, upon other Christians; and that in all other respects, especially with regard to that part of it which concerns the Person of our Lord Christ, they sincerely held the Catholick Faith.

12. *Sulpicius Severus*, a very grave Historian, confirms and illustrates this Testimony of *Eusebius* concerning the primitive Church of *Jerusalem*, and her Bishops, in these Words: *Because the Christians were thought*

thought for the moſt part Jews *(for then the Church of* Jeruſalem *had no Biſhop, but who was of the Circumciſion)* Adrian *order'd a Band of Soldiers to keep perpetual Watch, and hinder all the* Jews *from coming to* Jeruſalem. *This indeed was of good uſe to Chriſtianity, becauſe then almoſt all believ'd Chriſt to be God, and obſerv'd the Law. For it was order'd by Chriſt, that the Servitude of the Law ſhould be taken away by the Liberty of Faith and the Church.* Here the Words [*almoſt all*] are uſed, becauſe there were then at *Jeruſalem* (*a*) *Gentiles*, who embrac'd the Faith, although fewer than the *Jews*, who believ'd Chriſt to be God, without obſerving the Law. Now, what *Euſebius* reports from the Antients of the Chriſtians at *Jeruſalem*, who were of the Circumciſion, namely, that they had receiv'd the genuine Faith and Knowledge of Chriſt; the ſame, but a little more clearly, *Sulpicius* affirms here, when he teſtifies that they believ'd Chriſt to be God. Nothing can be more clear. Wherefore, if they who were called *Nazarenes*, were the Poſterity and Offspring of the Chriſtians of *Jeruſalem*, who were of the Circumciſion, (as moſt learned Men think;) and if they did really (as the Author of the *Irenicum* ſays) take Chriſt to be a mere Man, we muſt conclude, that they had gone off from the Faith of their Anceſtors.

13. But we have very good Authority for ſaying, that the *Nazarenes* alſo had more ſublime Notions of Chriſt. *Philaſtrius* does not charge them with any Hereſy concerning the Perſon of Chriſt; and *Auſtin*, in his Book of Hereſies, (*b*) after he had ſpoke of the *Cerinthians*, who taught that Men ſhould be circumciſed, and that ſuch other Precepts ought to be obſerv'd, that Jeſus was only a Man, *&c.* thus explains the Tenets of the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites* (*c*): *The* Nazarenes, *though they confeſs Chriſt to be the Son of God*, (and in that reſpect diſſent from the *Cerinthians*, who held that he was only Man) *yet obſerve all the old*

(*a*) *Chriſtians in the Emperor's Notion.*
(*b*) Cap. 8. (*c*) 9 & 10.

Law

Law (in this agreeing with the *Cerinthians*) *which the Chriſtians had learnt not to obſerve carnally from Apoſtolical Tradition, but to underſtand ſpiritually. The* Ebionites (juſt as the *Cerinthians*) *alſo ſaid that Chriſt was only Man; they obſerve the carnal Precepts of the Law*, &c. Here it is manifeſt (notwithſtanding this Author's Cavils) that *Auſtin* intended in this to diſtinguiſh the *Nazarenes* from the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*; that the *Nazarenes* did not confeſs him to be Man only, as the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*, but the Son of God, and ſo God. Beſides, it is well known what *Auſtin* meant by confeſſing Chriſt to be the Son of God; for he own'd no other Son of God than that, which was begotten of God the Father, before all Ages. Moreover, there is alſo a very plain Teſtimony of *Jerome*'s, where he thus writes concerning *Cerinthus*, *Ebion*, and the *Nazarenes* (*a*): *If this be true, we are fallen into the Hereſy of* Cerinthus *and* Ebion, *who believing in Chriſt, were for this alone anathematiz'd by the Fathers; That they mix'd the legal Ceremonies with the Chriſtian Goſpel, and ſo held the new, as not to let go the old. But why do I ſpeak of the* Ebionites, *who only pretend themſelves Chriſtians? Even to this Day, in all the Synagogues of the* Eaſt, *there is an Hereſy call'd the* Minæi, *commonly the* Nazarenes, *who believe in Chriſt the Son of God, born of the Virgin* Mary, *and ſay it is he who ſuffer'd under* Pontius Pilate, *and roſe again, in whom we believe. But whilſt they would both be* Jews *and Chriſtians, they are neither.* In which Words, *Jerome* agrees with *Auſtin*, and expreſly ſays, that they believ'd in that Son of God, in which we believe: ſo that he owns no difference between the *Nazarenes* and the Catholicks in this Doctrine of the Son of God. That this was *Jerome*'s Meaning, will yet be more plain, from his Deſign in the Place cited. There was a Controverſy between *Jerome* and *Auſtin*, upon the Words of St. *Paul* κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, Whether he did in

(*a*) Ep. 89. ad Auguſtin.

earneſt

earneſt blame *Peter*, or whether the whole was fictitious, and tranſacted between them in a holy Diſſimulation. *Auſtin* held the former, and that rightly: *Jerome*, from the Conſent of ſome *Greek* Interpreters, defended the latter, contrary to the plain Truth, rendering theſe Words, κατὰ πρόσωπον, not to his Face, but in Appearance. The chief Argument by which he defended his Opinion, (into which he ingenuouſly confeſſes that he fell by chance, whilſt in reading the *Greek* Commentaries, and treaſuring up ſeveral things in his Mind, he call'd for his Notary, and dictated to him ſometimes his own Thoughts, ſometimes another's, without Regard to Order, Words, or Senſe) was thus: That *Paul* himſelf ſometimes judaiz'd, therefore could not juſtly charge *Peter* with what he himſelf was guilty of. To this *Auſtin* very well anſwer'd, That *Paul* did not blame *Peter* for obſerving the *Jewiſh* Cuſtoms, in which he was born and educated, though he did not obſerve them among the *Gentiles*; but for impoſing them upon the *Gentiles* by his own Example, which *Paul* never did. For the legal Ceremonies might be indulg'd to the *Jews* for a Time, though they ought not to be impoſed upon the *Gentiles*. *Jerome*, not willing to take this Anſwer, inveighs againſt *Auſtin* in his oratorial manner, as though the Sum of his Opinion had been, that even ſince the Goſpel of Chriſt, the believing *Jews* might do well to keep the Precepts of the Law, *i. e.* offer Sacrifice, *&c.* Againſt this Opinion, which indeed is not *Auſtin*'s, he thus argues, fighting with his own Shadow: *If this be true, we are fallen into the Hereſy of* Ebion *and* Cerinthus, *who believing in Chriſt, were for this only anathematiz'd by the Fathers, that they mix'd the legal Ceremonies with the Chriſtian Goſpel.* In theſe Words, *Jerome* did not mean that *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* held no other Hereſy, for which they were anathematiz'd by the Fathers, (for he could not but know, that *Ebion* was condemn'd by the Antients for denying Chriſt's Divinity, and that *Cerinthus* was expell'd for the ſame, and ſome other heretical

heretical Tenets;) but that if they had been in all other reſpects Orthodox, this Error alone would have been ſufficient Ground for an Anathema. Now being ſenſible that he might be call'd to account for this, by the Adverſary he had rais'd to himſelf, he recedes from the Example of *Ebion* and *Cerinthus*, and puts the whole of his Cauſe upon another Example from the *Nazarenes*, which could not bear a Cavil. *But why*, ſays he, *do I ſpeak of the* Ebionites, *who pretend themſelves Chriſtians? Even to this Day, through all the Synagogues of the Eaſt*, &c. As if he ſhould ſay, As to the *Ebionites*, perhaps you'll object, and I don't deny it, that they had impious Notions concerning our Lord Chriſt, as though he was only a Man, therefore though they feign'd themſelves ſuch, they were not to be accounted true Chriſtians; but with reſpect to the *Nazarenes*, no ſuch thing can be pretended, they were in all things Catholick, except the Obſervation of the *Moſaical* Law; and yet for that, deem'd Hereticks by the Church. It is very plain, that this is *Jerome*'s Meaning. Now no body could know the Opinion of the *Nazarenes* better than *Jerome*, who had uſed their Converſation, and had been favour'd by them with an Opportunity of copying the *Hebrew* Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, as he himſelf tells us. (*a*)

14. To the Teſtimonies brought already, I will add two others, in which, though the *Nazarenes* are not particularly mention'd, they and their Opinion ſeem to me to be manifeſtly declar'd: The former ſhall be that of a Writer, without doubt, much antienter than any yet cited, *Juſtin Martyr*, in his Dialogue with *Trypho* the *Jew*; where *Trypho* propoſes ſome Queſtions concerning the Obſervation of the *Moſaical* Law to *Juſtin*'s Solution. The firſt, concerning thoſe who liv'd under the Law before the Coming of Chriſt, is this: *Shall they who liv'd according to the Law of* Moſes, *live with* Enoch, Noah, *and* Job, *in the Reſur-*

(*a*) De Scriptor. Eccl. in Matth.

rection?

rection? To which *Justin* answers (*a*): *In the Law of* Moses, *those Things which are naturally excellent, pious and just, are enacted to be perform'd by the Obedient; and also those things are found in it, which were commanded for the hardness of the Peoples Hearts, which they also observ'd, who were under the Law. Wherefore, they who did such things, as were universally, naturally, and perpetually good, pleased God, and by this Christ shall be sav'd in the Resurrection, as well as those their just and pious Ancestors* Enoch, Noah, Job, *or any others; together with those who acknowledge this Christ the Son of God, who was before* Lucifer *and the Moon; and who being incarnate by a Virgin of the Stock of* David, *condescended to be born, that by this Dispensation the Serpent, malignant from the Beginning, and the Angels, like him, might be subdued, Death vanquish'd, and might wholly cease from them at the second Coming of Christ, who believe in him, and live as he would have them, and then might be no more; when some shall be sent into the Condemnation and Punishment of eternal Fire; and others live together in a Freedom from suffering, in Incorruptibility, in Indolence and Immortality.* Of which Answer this is the plain Meaning: That those, who living under the Law of *Moses*, both observ'd the Rites impos'd upon them by God, and especially faithfully obey'd the eternal Laws of Justice; as also the pious Men who were before the Law, should obtain eternal Life through the Grace of Christ, together with us Christians, although they had not that explicit Faith concerning Christ, which is now requir'd of us. And that the explicit Faith requisite to our Salvation, under the Gospel, is, to acknowledge Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, who was before Ages; and in the Fulness of Time being incarnate, was made Man of a Virgin, in order by that Dispensation, to subdue the Devil and Death; who shall come again in the End of the World to judge all Men, to punish the Wicked with eternal Fire, and exalt the Pious to

(*a*) Pag. 263, & 264.

the Kingdom of eternal Glory and Bliſs. Here, by the way, let the Reader obſerve the Rule of Faith concerning Chriſt, given by *Juſtin*, as neceſſary to Salvation, and lay it up in his Memory, to ſerve him upon occaſion. After this, *Trypho* asks whether he who embrac'd this Faith concerning Chriſt, and retain'd with it the Obſervation of the *Moſaical* Law, could be ſav'd? *But if*, ſays he, *ſome Perſons will ſtill live in the Obſervation of the* Moſaical *Law, and yet believe in this crucify'd Jeſus, owning him to be the very Chriſt of God*, (namely, what you, *Juſtin*, have juſt now deſcribed him) *and that the Judgment of all things is committed to him, and that his Kingdom is eternal* (as you have alſo aſſerted) *can theſe alſo be ſav'd?* To this Queſtion before *Juſtin* anſwers, he, in his turn, asks *Trypho* ſome things concerning thoſe Rites which can, or cannot be obſerv'd ſince the Deſtruction of the Temple. After *Trypho* has diſpatch'd theſe, he repeats his Queſtion, and again asks whether he who holds the Faith in Chriſt, above deſcrib'd, and yet will obſerve thoſe legal Rites, which can be obſerved now, may be ſav'd? To which *Juſtin* at length anſwers, in theſe Words: *It is my Opinion*, Trypho, *that ſuch an one ſhall be ſav'd, unleſs he univerſally and ſtrenuouſly contends to perſuade others, I mean thoſe of the* Gentiles, *who have been circumcis'd from Error by Chriſt, to obſerve the ſame things he does, and affirms they can't be ſav'd except they do ſo.* From theſe Words [*It is my Opinion*] *Trypho* takes occaſion to ask another Queſtion: *Are there any then, who ſay ſuch Men ſhall not be ſav'd?* As if he ſhould have ſaid, It ſeems ſtrange to me, that any Chriſtian ſhould deny them Salvation who believe as they do in all other reſpects, for this Reaſon only, That they are tenacious of a Law made by God. But *Juſtin* anſwers: *There are ſuch*, Trypho, *and thoſe who carry the Matter ſo far, as that they dare not converſe or eat with them; but I am not of their mind.* They thought that after ſo long and ſo clear a Promulgation of Chriſt's Goſpel, *Moſes*'s Law was not only

only dead, but killing. Nor does *Justin* deny it at all, but grants that some of these *Judaizing* Christians may be saved, namely they only who through Infirmity (as he says afterwards) adhered to the *Mosaical* Rites. Hence then it is clear, that there were *Jews* in *Justin*'s time, who mix'd the Catholick Faith of Christ, namely, that he was the Son of God, who existed before all Creatures, and at a certain time was incarnate for the Salvation of Men, and was made Man of a Virgin, with the Observation of the Ritual Law of *Moses*; but yet would not impose the necessity of observing this Law upon the *Gentile* Christians. Who were these, I beseech you? No other certainly than the *Nazarenes*, or Christians of *Jerusalem*, who now in the Days of *Justin* had been driven out of their own Country by *Adrian* (*a*). These things *Justin* wrote concerning the *Nazarenes*; for some time after in the same Dialogue, he transiently lashes the Tenet of the *Ebionites*, as we shall shew hereafter, when we come to *Episcopius*'s Arguments.

15. Another Testimony I shall fetch from the sixth Book of the *Apostolical Institutions*, where the Author, reckoning up the Hereticks who disturb'd the Apostolical Church, in particular touches upon the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*, where he takes notice of those who taught, that it was necessary to be circumcis'd according to the Law, and to believe in Jesus Christ, as an holy Man and a Prophet. Afterwards he explains the Apostolical Doctrine against all the Hereticks, whose mad Tenets he had before mention'd. But in the end of the Chapter, he expounds the Catholick Faith in these Words, directly against *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* (*b*): *We confess Christ, not a mere Man, but God the Word and Man, the Mediator of God and Men, the High Priest of the Father; neither are we circumcis'd, as the* Jews *are.* In the Chapter immediately following, (*c*) he has to do with others, who thought the Rituals of *Moses* were

(*a*) Vol. I. P. A. p. 339. (*b*) P. 340. (*c*) P. 341.

to be obſerved by them. The Title of the Chapter is, *Againſt them who confeſs* [Chriſt] *and yet will Judaize, i. e.* Againſt thoſe who in all other things held the Catholick Faith explain'd in the Chapter before, and eſpecially that part of it which is in the laſt Chapter, namely, that Chriſt is God and Man, but yet ſo far conſented to the *Jews*, and departed from the Chriſtians, as ſtill to adhere to the ritual Law of *Moſes*. Now who can doubt but that theſe, who confeſs'd, and would notwithſtanding Judaize, were the very *Nazarenes*. After this manner we before heard *Jerome* teſtifying concerning the *Nazarenes*, that they confeſs'd the ſame Son of God in whom we believe, but, whereas they would be both *Jews* and Chriſtians, they were really neither: and indeed you will never find any but the *Nazarenes*, to whom *Pſeudo-Clement*'s Deſcription agrees.

16. The Teſtimony of one Man, (*a*) *Theodoret*, a Writer of the later Age, affirming, that the *Nazarenes* only honour'd Chriſt as a juſt Man, is of little weight againſt theſe ſo many, and ſo conſiderable Teſtimonies of the Antients. As for (*b*) *Epiphanius*, tho he joins the *Nazarenes* to the *Cerinthians* as Men of the ſame Sentiments, yet in the ſame *Hereſy* he ingenuouſly confeſſes, that he had not found what opinion the *Nazarenes* had of Chriſt, namely, whether they held the *Cerinthian* Impiety, or the Catholick Notion. For thus he writes concerning them: *Concerning Chriſt, I cannot ſay whether hurry'd on by the Impiety of the* Cerinthians, *or* Merinthians, *they think him to be a mere Man; or, as the truth is, affirm that he was begotten of* Mary *by the Holy Spririt.* 'Tis clear then that *Epiphanius* did not know their Tenets. What he had inconſiderately ſaid before, that the Opinions of the *Cerinthians* and *Nazarenes* were alike, *Theodoret*, who writes after him, ſeems to have taken up, and from thence to have deliver'd, that the *Nazarenes* as well as the *Cerinthians*

(*a*) Hæretic. Fab. Lib. 2. Cap. 2. (*b*) Hæreſ. 29. Cap. 1.

honour'd

honour'd Christ only as a just Man. *Epiphanius* indeed writes, that the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites* laid their heads together, and communicated to each other their wicked Heresy. Nor is it unlikely indeed that the latter *Nazarenes*, a long time rejected and despis'd by the generality of Christians, contracted a familiarity with the *Ebionites* upon account of their common Sentiment concerning the Observation of the *Mosaical* Rites, and from thence that some of them were at length polluted by their Heresy. Perhaps also the *Ebionites*, call'd the Later, or the Less, who are not mention'd by any one before *Origen*, might be of the number of these degenerated *Nazarenes*. But however, the plain Testimonies just now alledg'd by us from the Antients put it out of all doubt, that there were *Nazarenes* long after the Siege of *Jerusalem* in *Adrian*'s time, and at least down to the times of *Jerome* and *Austin*, who kept the Faith of the first *Nazarenes*, the primitive Christian Church of the Circumcision at *Jerusalem*, entire; namely, who believed Christ to be God, tho they observ'd the Law.

17. From all these it appears sufficiently, how the Author of the *Irenicum* does in vain fatigue himself in colouring the execrable Heresy of the *Ebionites*, and in challenging it as the very Tenet deliver'd by the Apostles themselves to the first Christians at *Jerusalem*, namely, to the *Nazarenes*. It is not necessary then to contend much with this Sophist about the Name *EBION*, and the Original of it. But yet, since I find some learned Catholicks are of his Opinion in this Point, so as to deny that there ever was an Heresiarch, whose Name was *Ebion*; and that the Name of *Ebionites* was antiently given to those Jewish Christians, by way of Reproach, who had a low and mean Opinion of our Lord; I shall therefore say something briefly concerning this Matter. One of the most antient Heresiologers we now have, *Tertullian* I mean, expresly says in a place afore-cited, that there was once a Fellow of that Name, who thus far went along with *Cerinthus*,

rinthus, as to teach that our Lord was only Man. *Philaſtrius*, *Jerome* and *Epiphanius* agree with *Tertullian*; ſo alſo *Ruffinus* and others (*a*). Nor does it ſignify any thing againſt this, that the Word *Ebion* (as many have obſerved) in the *Hebrew* denotes [*poor*]. For from this you can conclude no more, than that the Notion of *Ebion* concerning Chriſt, correſponded to his Name. Thus in the *Sacred Scriptures*, *As his Name is, ſo is he; his Name is* Nabal, *and Folly is with him.* The like Alluſions to the Names of *Hereſiarchs* frequently occur in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. So *Euſebius* (*b*) concerning the *Manichees*: *Then alſo* Manes, *or the mad Man, of a Name worthy his deviliſh Hereſy, attempted the ſubverſion of* * *Reaſon; the Devil himſelf, that Oppoſer of God, Satan having produced him for the Deſtruction of many.* In like manner, *Gregory Nazianzen* ſpeaks of (*c*) *Arius*: Arius, *ſirnam'd ſo from Fury, diſturb'd and corrupted a great part of the Church.* Upon which place *Nicetas* makes this Note; Arius *from* Ἄρης, Mars, *a very turbulent and furious Dæmon.* Hence his Followers are by *Athanaſius* and others call'd *Ariomanitæ*. More of this kind might be produc'd, if it were worth the while. *Epiphanius* (*d*) plainly expounds and confirms our Opinion, where he thus diſcourſes concerning *Ebion*'s Name: Ebion, *tranſlated from* Hebrew *into* Greek, *is* Πτωχὸς, (*or* Poor *in* Engliſh.) *And well might he be call'd poor in Underſtanding, in Hope, and in Deed, who thought Chriſt a mere Man, one who had hope in him upon a poor ground of Faith.* A little after he adds; *He was truly and naturally call'd* Ebion, *who by Prophecy, I ſuppoſe, had the very Name of it, poor and miſerable Wretch, from his Parents.*

18. Therefore they only were antiently call'd *Ebionites*, who were the Diſciples of the Hereſiarch *Ebion*, and embraced both his Tenets, that the *Moſaical* Law

(*a*) Hieron. adv. Luciferian. cap. 8. Epiphan. Hæreſ. 30. Ruffin. in Symbol. prope finem. (*b*) Lib. 7. cap. 31. p. 231.

* Λογισμὸν, *Of the Doctrine concerning the* Λόγος.

(*c*) De Ario. Orat. 20. (*d*) Hæreſ. 30. cap. 17.

muſt

muſt be obſerv'd, and that Chriſt was a mere Man: But afterwards we are taught *by* (*a*) *Origen alone*, that about the middle of the third Century, thoſe were called *Ebionites* by ſome, who held Chriſtianity together with the Obſervation of the Law: *Some of the* Jews, *who believe on Jeſus, don't forſake the Law of their Fathers. They live according to it, and have gotten themſelves a Name ſuitable to the Meanneſs and Poverty of their Law. For a poor Man is call'd* Ebion *by the* Jews, *and they of the* Jews *who receive Jeſus as the Chriſt, are called* Ebionites. No body that I know of, except *Origen*, has ſaid this. But ſtill this may juſtly be obſerv'd from this Paſſage, that thoſe who were then in that larger Senſe call'd *Ebionites*, were not ſo call'd, becauſe they, like the firſt *Ebionites*, thoſe properly ſo nam'd, thought lowly and meanly concerning Chriſt, (for we have prov'd that all the *Jews* who believ'd in Chriſt, and obſerv'd the Law, were not of that Opinion) but becauſe of the Poverty of the Law to which they adhered, or becauſe (as St. *Paul* ſpeaks) they yet valued, and had in religious Eſteem, thoſe weak and beggarly Elements. Now in another Place, (*b*) *Origen* ſpeaks concerning the *Ebionites*, in a ſtricter Senſe ſo call'd, thoſe who own'd not the Divinity of Chriſt, as of Perſons, who were indigent, or wanting as to the Faith of Chriſt. Thus much we have at large diſcourſed (for ſo the nature of the thing required) concerning the Hereticks, who deny'd the Divinity of our Lord in the firſt Century. What relates to the Hereticks of the two following Ages, who defended the ſame impious Tenet, we ſhall, by God's Permiſſion, diſpatch with more brevity.

(*a*) Lib. 2. p. 56. (*b*) Comment. Ed. Huet. p. 427, 428.

CHAP. III.

Of those who deny'd Jesus Christ to be True God, in the second and third Ages.

ABOUT the Year 190, when *Severus* was Emperor, *Theodotus* of *Byzantium*, from his Trade call'd *Coriarius*, dar'd openly to affirm and defend the pernicious Tenet of the *Ebionites*. *Caius the Presbyter*, or some other antient Writer, calls him (*a*) the Prince and Father of the Atheistical Apostasy, who first said that Christ was mere Man. I suppose he intended that he was the first among those who were purely Christians, Christians of the *Gentiles*; for as much as the more early Asserters of this Blasphemy, generally defended *Judaism* under the Profession of Christianity, and were rather to be accounted Members of the Synagogue than the Church, *Jews* than Christians, or something betwixt both. Hence the *Ebionites* were by some of the Antients thrown into the List of *Jewish* Heresies, and distinguished, as we shall shew hereafter, from the Hereticks which arose in the Christian Church. *Tertullian* (*b*) says of this *Theodotus*, and his Heresy; *Besides these was one* Theodotus *of* Byzantium, *who being apprehended as a Christian, denied* [his Profession] *and ever after blasphemed Christ. For he introduced the Doctrine of his being purely Man, and denied his Divinity; of his being indeed born of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit, but being only and barely Man, in nothing superior to other Men, but only in Justice.* *Epiphanius* (*c*), *Austin*, and almost all the Heresiologers, give the same Account of him. Now

(*a*) Euseb. E. H. Lib. 5. cap. 28. p. 159. (*b*) Pag. 223.
(*c*) Hæres. 54. De Hæres. Cap. 33.

this

this impious Opiniator was anathematiz'd by *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, as (*d*) *Caius* teſtifies.

2. I can't think it too much here to recite a remarkable Story, which the ſame *Caius* tells us in the ſame place, and which is very appoſite to our preſent purpoſe. *I will put many of our Brethren in mind of a notable Action in our days; what, if it had happened in* Sodom, *would, I think, have brought the Inhabitants of it to repentance. There was one* Natalis *a Confeſſor, who liv'd in the preſent Age, and not long ago. This Man, as it happen'd, was ſeduced by* Aſclepiodotus *and another* Theodotus, *a Silver-Smith, both of them Diſciples of that* Theodotus *the Currier, who was firſt excommunicated by* Victor *then Biſhop* (as I ſaid before) *for this Opinion, or rather Madneſs. Theſe Perſons perſuaded* Natalis *to accept a Salary, and be made Biſhop of the Hereſy, or Sect. The Sum they were to pay him, was one hundred and fifty* Denarii *a Month. Being now made one of them, he was often rebuk'd by the Lord in Dreams. For our moſt merciful God and Lord Jeſus Chriſt would not that he ſhould periſh out of the Church, who had been a Confeſſor of his Sufferings in it. But when* Natalis *little regarded theſe Night-Viſions, being captivated by the Honour of Precedency among them, and the Deſire of filthy Lucre (which has deſtroy'd many) he was at length beaten with Whips, and much wounded by Saints all the whole Night; ſo that he aroſe as ſoon as it was Light, put on Sackcloth and Aſhes, and immediately threw himſelf with Tears at the Feet of* Zephyrinus *the Biſhop, proſtrated himſelf not only to the Clergy, but the Laity; affected and mov'd the merciful Church of the merciful Saviour with his weeping. Having uſed much intreaty, and ſhew'd them the Stripes of thoſe Wounds he had received when a Confeſſor, he was at laſt with difficulty admitted to Communion.* So hard was it for a Man, who had otherwiſe deſerved very well of Chriſtianity, to recover the Peace of the Church, after he had fall'n into that impious Hereſy. As for the repeated Viſions, in which Chriſt is

(*d*) *In the place juſt now cited from* Euſebius.

ſaid

ſaid to have ſhew'd himſelf an Aſſertor of his own Majeſty, and to have chaſtis'd the Madneſs of the laps'd Confeſſor, no Man will eaſily reject them, who obſerves that they are told by the very Confeſſor himſelf, when a ſerious Penitent for his very foul Lapſe, before many Witneſſes, to the moſt of whom then living, the grave Author of this Story appeals; and who recollects that there are many Examples of ſuch Viſions, even in the moſt authentick Writings of the third Century. *See the very learned* Dodwell's Cyprianic Diſſertations (*e*).

3. Not far from the beginning of the third Century, there was one *Artemon*, or *Artemas*, an Enforcer of the *Theodotian* Hereſy. Againſt him and his Diſciples, *Caius*, or the antient Writer, above-cited, wrote a learned Piece. In that the Author, as *Euſebius* (*f*) ſays, writes exactly thus of the *Artemonites: They affirm that all the Antients, and even the Apoſtles themſelves, receiv'd and taught what they now aſſert; that the true Doctrine was preſerv'd till the times of* Victor *the thirteenth Biſhop of* Rome *from* Peter, *but was adulterated in the time of his Succeſſor* Zephyrinus. *Now what they ſay might ſeem true, may be, unleſs the Holy Scriptures were againſt it in the firſt place, and then the Books of certain Brethren more antient than* Victor, *which they wrote in defence of the Truth, againſt the* Gentiles, *and the Hereticks of their own Age. Such are* Juſtin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clement, *and many others, in all whoſe Writings the Divinity of Chriſt is maintain'd. As for the Books of* Irenæus, Melito, &c. *in which they have preached Chriſt, as God and Man, they are too well known to be mentioned.* The (*g*) Pſalms alſo and Songs *of the Brethren wrote from the beginning by the Faithful, do all celebrate Chriſt as the Word of God, and aſcribe to him Divinity. Since then the Doctrine of the Church has been preached ſo many Years ago, how is it that all Perſons*

(*e*) Diſſertation IV. *upon* Ep. 8. (*f*) Euſeb. E. H. Lib. 5. cap. 28. p. 158, 159. (*g*) *See* Pliny Ep. 97. Lib. 10. *And the Obſervations upon this place of* Caius, *in the Defence of the N. C.* Sect. 3. cap. 2. ſect. 5.

have

have only promulg'd their Doctrine till Victor's *Days? Where is their Modesty to dress up such a Calumny against* Victor, *when they know that* Theodotus Coriarius, *the Author and Parent of that impious Defection, and who first asserted that Christ was mere Man, was excommunicated for it by* Victor? *For if, as they say,* Victor *approved their Blasphemy, why did he remove the Author of it,* Theodotus, *from the Church?* I have the more willingly transcribed this entire and remarkable Fragment of the learned Author, that all Persons may see the prodigious Impudence of the *Irenicum*, which calls the *Artemonites*, the most creditable Evidences of Apostolick Tradition. For surely it is from hence clear, that they stood convicted of the most flagrant Untruth in this Pretence. Nay, I dare affirm that this one Fragment of our venerable Author rightly consider'd, is a sufficient Confutation of all the fictitious Stuff pack'd up together by that Scribler. But what is most to our purpose, it is also very clear that the *Artemonites* were thrown out of the Catholick Church, from the Words of the *Antiochian Fathers* concerning *Paulus Samosatenus* then Anathematiz'd: Thus they (*a*) speak in their Synodical Epistle, *Let him write to* Artemas, *and let the* Artemonites *communicate with him.*

4. In the same (*b*) Age not long after, *Beryllus* the Bishop of *Bostra* overturning the Rule of the Church, *attempted to bring in certain Doctrines different from the Truth, presuming to say, that our Lord and Saviour did not properly exist before he came among Men, nor had a proper Divinity, but only the Administration of the Father's committed to him.* From these Words of *Eusebius*, one may conjecture that he [*Beryllus*] alluded to the Heresy of *Noetus*, afterwards *Sabellianism.* But *Jerome* has said no such thing of him. I'll cite his Words presently. Now a great many Bishops met in Council against him, with an intent, no doubt, to excommu-

(*a*) Euseb. E. H. Lib. 7. cap. 30. p. 230.
(*b*) Euseb. E. H. Lib. 6. cap. 33. p. 188.

nicate

nicate him; but *Origen* being there, and convincing him of his Error, he submitted to the Truth, and return'd to the *Antient sound Sentiment.* Thus also (*a*) *Jerome* speaks of him: Beryllus *the Bishop of* Bostra *in* Arabia, *after he had governed the Church gloriously for some time, at last falling into that Heresy, which denies that Christ was before his Incarnation, being set right by* Origen, *wrote several little Pieces, and especially Epistles, in which he thanks* Origen, *&c.*

5. About the (*b*) Year 260, the famous *Paul,* call'd *Samosatenus* from his own Country, and from his See *Antiochenus,* reviv'd the Heresy of the *Artemonites. He had a low and mean Opinion of Christ, contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, as tho he was only a common Man by Nature.* Thus (*c*) *Athanasius* writes of him: Paul *of* Samosata *confesses God of the Virgin, God born in* Nazareth, *thence taking the beginning of his Existence, and of his Kingdom; he also confesses the Word and Wisdom from Heaven active in him, which by Predestination was before Ages, but was only in Act exhibited from* Nazareth. Here by the Word, which is in Christ, *Paul* understood not the Person of the Word, or Son of God; for he own'd no such Word: but a certain Divine Power, by which he was conceiv'd in the Womb of the Virgin, and which ever after operated in him. Thus only did he think that Christ was conceiv'd by the Holy Spirit, (for he did not own any such thing as a Divine Person under that Name) and for this reason did he believe that he was call'd God in Scripture. *Austin* (*d*) says of the same *Paul* and his Followers: *The* Paulians, *from* Paulus Samosat. *say, That Christ was not always, that he took his Beginning from his Birth of the Virgin, and they think him nothing but a Man. This was formerly the Heresy of one* Artemon, *but retriev'd in its decay by* Paulus. But let us hear the Fathers of the *Antiochian* Synod, who certainly best understood *Paul's*

(*a*) De Script. Eccl. cap. 71. (*b*) Euseb. Lib. 7. cap. 27. p. 226. (*c*) Tom. 1. Pars 2. p. 942, (*d*) De Hæres. c. 44.

Opinion.

Opinion. They in their (*a*) *Synodical* Epiſtle teſtify, that this *Paul* deny'd his God and Lord, *i. e.* deny'd the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Chriſt. A little after in the ſame Epiſtle they ſay, that he would not with them confeſs that the Son of God came down from Heaven; but ſaid that he was from below. Laſtly, in the ſame place they expreſly call him a Perſon who has abjur'd the Myſtery, and gone in to the execrable Hereſy of *Artemas*. *Paul* then and *Artemas* agreed in their Notion of Chriſt.

6. Some of the Antients ſay, that *Paul* made his Court to *Zenobia*, a *Jeweſs* (as (*b*) *Athanaſius* ſays) but however much addicted to *Judaiſm*, and then Queen of the Eaſt, by the defence of this *Jewiſh* Blaſphemy. So (*c*) *Chryſoſtom* and *Theodoret*. After ſome ſuch ſort the modern Defenders of *Arian* and *Samoſatenian* Principles with us, contend that the Doctrine of Chriſt the coeſſential Son of the Father, and conſequently that of the Holy conſubſtantial Trinity, ſhould be wholly ſuppreſs'd in the Church, that it may not give any further hindrance to the Converſion of the *Turks* and *Jews* (*d*). They would have us, forſooth, not to be Chriſtians indeed, that we may make a ſort of Chriſtians of thoſe Infidels.

7. There were two Synods of Biſhops aſſembled againſt this impious Man, at *Antioch*. In the former of them indeed, under the (*e*) Emperor *Gallienus*, about the twelfth Year of his Reign, and the 265th Year of Chriſt, the *Sophiſt deceiv'd the Biſhops* by Pretences, and eſcap'd with *impunity*: But in the latter, a very numerous Synod, under *Aurelian* about the Year 270, *Malchion*, a Presbyter, and a very learned Perſon, detected his Hereſy plainly; and then he was not only degraded from the Epiſcopal Dignity, but alſo entirely forbidden all Communion with the Catholick Church. *Eu-*

(*a*) Euſeb. Lib. 7. cap. 30. p. 228. (*b*) Tom. 1. Pars 1. p. 386. (*c*) Homil. 8. in Joannem. Hæretic. Fab. Lib. 2. cap. 8. (*d*) *See the Anſwer to the Queries*, p. 14. (*e*) Euſeb. E. H. Lib. 7. cap. 27, & 28. p. 226, & 227.

ſebius

ſebius (*a*) thus briefly gives us the Hiſtory of that Synod: *In the Times of this Emperor* [Aurelian] *a Synod of very many Biſhops was aſſembled; in which this Hereſiarch* Paul, *was convicted at* Antioch, *and being by all found guilty of that falſe Tenet, was excommunicated the* whole *Catholick Church under Heaven. One* Malchion, *a very eloquent Man, did chiefly confute and diſcover his ſtudy'd Subterfuges.* It is worthy Obſervation, how vehemently and how ſharply the holy Fathers inveigh againſt the Hereſiarch, and his Hereſy, in their Synodical Epiſtle: (*b*) They call him a Man, *who denied his God, who receded from the Rule of Faith,* i. e. *was an Apoſtate, who ſet himſelf in oppoſition to God.* They call his Opinion *a deadly Doctrine, ſuch a degree of Malice as denied God, an execrable Hereſy.* Hence it is manifeſt, that the Great and Holy Synod, and conſequently the Catholick Church of that Age, thought the Doctrine of our Lord's real Divinity abſolutely neceſſary to be known and believ'd in order to Salvation.

8. I remember not any other Perſon in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the third Century, who, after this *Paul*, oppos'd the Divinity of our Saviour, except one *Lucian*, who was alſo excommunicated for it. (*c*)

9. Some of our modern *Arians* may here object, that all the Hereticks afore-mention'd denied that Chriſt was before *Mary*, which the *Arians* acknowledge, yea, they confeſs that he was before all Ages; therefore all that is urged, how much ſoever it may concern the *Socinians*, does not all affect the *Arians*: but this is nothing to the purpoſe. For it is plain that the Hereticks afore-mention'd, were condemn'd by the Church, for a Reaſon common to them with the *Arians* themſelves, namely, for denying that our Saviour was God. Look back upon what has been obſerv'd in this Chapter concerning *Theodotus*, *Artemon*, and *Paul* of *Samoſata*, from the Antients, and

(*a*) Chap. 29. p. 227. (*b*) E. H. Euſeb. Lib. 7. chap. 30.
(*c*) *See the Defence of the* Nicene Creed, Sect. 2. chap. 13. ſect. 8.

you'll

you'll see that the Fathers place every one of their Heresies in this; not that they made our Saviour a Being lower in the Creation than he really was, but that they made him a mere Creature, and did not own him as truly God. In a word, they were convicted of and condemn'd for a Heresy, that denied God, as *Caius* says of *Theodotus* and *Artemon*, and the *Antiochian* Fathers of *Paul* of *Samosata*. Now certainly the Heresy of *Arius* was no less an Heresy that denied God than theirs: nor was the Difference betwixt their Opinion and that of *Arius* such, as that the Church could think the one tolerable, but the other worthy the severest Censure. For by both of them Christ was determin'd to be a mere Man, only they were not agreed upon the Time when he began to be so.

10. This notwithstanding we must add, which we have elsewhere observ'd, that the very principal Tenets of *Arius*, namely, of the Production of the Word before Ages, but yet from some Beginning, and of the Distance of his Essence from the Nature of the supreme God, were formerly condemn'd in the Church in the most antient Hereſiarchs, *i. e.* the *Gnosticks* (*a*). Nor is the famous History of *Dionysius Alexandrinus* to be forgot, who being falsely accus'd by the *Sabellians* to *Dionysius Romanus*, of those same Tenets, which *Arius* afterwards asserted; when *Dionysius Romanus* call'd a Synod upon that Occasion, in which the Tenets were universally condemn'd as impious, *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, who was said to defend them, had certainly been condemn'd, unless he had seasonably clear'd himself, by Letters, from *that foul Calumny*. (*b*) I suppose, then, it is very plain, from what has been largely discours'd in this Chapter, and that before it, that the Opinion which denies our Sa-

(*a*) *Defence of the* Nicene Creed, Sect. 2. chap. 1. sect. 15. Sect 3. chap. 1. sect. 15, and 16. chap. 10. sect. 16.

(*b*) *See this History at large in the Defence of the* Nicene Creed, Sect. 2. chap. 11. sect. 2. *&c.*

viour

viour to be true God, was always held in the Church of the three first Ages for a deadly Heresy, and a detestable Blasphemy; and that those who asserted it, were absolutely rejected as impious Opiniators, and utter Strangers to the true saving Faith of Christ. Strange, then! that *Episcopius* should, with any Sophisms or Pretences (for he could bring nothing solid against such plain Testimonies) attempt to defend his contrary Assertion. Whatever it is he has said in this forlorn Cause, I shall now proceed to examine accurately.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Creeds of the Primitive Church: And first, of the first and most antient Creed, and the Explications of it in Irenæus *and* Tertullian.

FOR the Proof of his Proposition, namely, [That the Faith and Profession of that special Filiation of Jesus Christ, by which he is said to be the Son of God before Ages, and God of God, was not judged necessary to Salvation in the primitive Churches from the Time of the Apostles, at least during three whole Centuries] *Episcopius* (*a*) brings two Arguments; the first of which is this: (1.) *The Creeds of the Churches, by which antiently Christians were distinguish'd from Infidels, as by certain Badges and Tokens, and upon the Profession of which Men were matriculated into Christianity, prove it*, says he. *For in them no such Profession is required or made. The most antient of them, and that which prevail'd in the first Administration of Baptism,*

(*a*) Episcopii Vol. prim. p. 340.

even

even from the Times of the Apostles, was this: I believe in God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; according to the Form prescrib'd by our Saviour himself, Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. *None of the antient Explanations of this Creed, which we have in* Irenæus, Tertullian, *&c. contain the Profession of this Filiation, much less declare the Necessity of professing it. And yet* Irenæus *speaks greatly of his Creed, as so perfect, that the best Skill in Divinity could make no Additions, nor the greatest Simplicity detract from it. Tertullian* also says of his, *That though a Man knew nothing besides it, he knew all things,* &c. *That the Creed call'd the Apostles, in what Time soever it was made (for that is uncertain) was by degrees augmented by the Addition of this or that Article, as several Heresies gave occasion, is what I never doubt: This, like the other, is so accurately compos'd, that some, the* Romanists *namely, have believ'd, though falsely, that it was made by all the Apostles, every one giving even the very Words of one Article, and some one of them by consent putting them together; but, however this be, all Christian Churches have receiv'd it as an undoubted, perfect, Catholick Rule of Faith, if not as it stood in the three first Ages, at least as it hath continu'd from the fourth Century to this day: This Creed, I say, makes no mention of this Filiation, but is content with that short Form,* I believe in Jesus Christ his Only Son our Lord.

2. I answer, (1.) That such Arguments are of no force in this Matter; for when it is sufficiently prov'd from the Testimonies above-cited, and as clear as possible, that the Faith and Profession of this peculiar Filiation of Jesus Christ, was by the Primitive Churches judg'd necessary to Salvation, who will believe him that goes about to prove the contrary, because the Creeds us'd by those Churches does not plainly enough contain that Faith and Profession? We should rather conclude quite contrary, namely, that since it is very plain from other Arguments, that the Faith and Profession of that Filiation was judg'd ab-

ſolutely neceſſary to Salvation by the Primitive Churches, it muſt be, that this peculiar Filiation was either very plainly contain'd in the Creeds they uſed, or certainly by them thought to be ſo. Nay, it is certain indeed, that the Catholick Doctors, who liv'd long before the *Nicene* Creed, thought the Doctrine of our Lord's true Divinity to be really contain'd in the Rule of Faith, or Creed then receiv'd in the Church. For *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter, expreſly affirm it to belong to the Rule of Faith. *Caius* alſo *(a)* ſays of the *Artemonites*, who denied Chriſt to be God, that they deſpis'd the Rule of antient Faith. So the *Antiochian* Fathers, *(b)* in their Synodical Epiſtle, ſay, that *Paul* of *Samoſata* departed from the Faith, was an *Apoſtate*. Therefore *Epiſcopius's* Argument, if it proves any thing, proves this only, that the Primitive Churches have not clearly enough expreſs'd that Article in their Creeds; which, notwithſtanding, they thought neceſſary. But (2.) there is no Ground for this Impeachment; and, to make it plain that there is not, we will go through the Creeds which he mentions, all along treading in his Steps.

3. *The moſt antient of them*, ſays he, *and what was uſed in the firſt Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, even from the Times of the Apoſtles themſelves, was this: I believe in God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.* I anſwer, (1.) That was never taken to be a full and compleat Creed, which did expreſly comprehend all the neceſſary Articles of Faith, (a Man muſt ſcarce be in his Senſes, to think the whole Chriſtian Faith was comprehended in ſo ſmall a Compaſs) but only a ſhort and compendious Confeſſion of the primary Article of the Holy Trinity, to be made by the Perſon to be baptiz'd, who was firſt taught the Senſe of it by the Catechiſt more fully and exactly. (2.) But yet in this Creed (ſuch as it is) the true Divinity of the Son (and even of the Holy Spi-

(*a*) Euſeb. E. H. Lib. 5. chap. ult. p. 160.
(*b*) Lib. 7. chap. 30. p. 228.

rit)

rit) is as plainly deliver'd as poſſible in ſo few Words. For (1.) it is manifeſt, that in this Form, [*I believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*] that the Word *God* is in common apply'd to all the Three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. This the *Greeks* expreſs more clearly [by their diſtinctive Article] Πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, τὸν πατέρα, τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Thus alſo the Antients underſtood this ſhort Confeſſion. Hence (*a*) *Tertullian*, expounding the common Faith of the Chriſtians, in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, ſays: *The Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God, and every one of them is God.* *Cyprian* alſo thus argues againſt the Baptiſm of Hereticks: (*b*) *If any one could be baptiz'd among the Hereticks, he might alſo retain Remiſſion of Sins; and if he obtain'd Remiſſion of Sins, be ſanctify'd and made the Temple of God. I ask, of what God? If of the Creator, he could not, who did not believe in him; if of Chriſt, neither could he be his Temple, who denies Chriſt to be God: If of the Holy Spirit, ſince theſe Three are One, how could the Holy Spirit be reconciled to him, who is an Enemy to the Father and the Son?* Where he plainly alludes to the Form of Confeſſion, concerning the Holy Trinity, which was uſually requir'd of thoſe who were to be baptiz'd, in which they profeſs'd to believe the Father was God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghoſt God, and that theſe Three are One. By the way, the attentive Reader may obſerve, that in this place St. *Cyprian* manifeſtly teaches, that the Article of the true Divinity of our Lord is abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation: For he expreſly ſays, that he can't be the Temple of God (which is the ſame as to ſay, he can't be ſav'd) who denies Chriſt to be God. But to return, I think that in theſe few Words, *I believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*, that great Truth, that the Son and Holy Ghoſt are one God with the Father, is, in ſome reſpects, more clearly ex-

(*a*) Pag. 507. adv. Prax. (*b*) P. 203.

preſs'd, than in the larger Creeds that followed: For by the Additions after thoſe Words, *I believe in God the Father*, and the Additions after the Mention of the Son, the Word *God* not being repeated in the Articles concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Title of God might ſeem, and indeed did ſeem (contrary to the plain Meaning of thoſe that made them) to belong only to the Father. (2.) In this Form the Son (as alſo the Holy Spirit) is joined to the Father as Collegue in his Government, as Sharer of that Faith, Honour, Worſhip and Obedience, which the Perſon to be baptiz'd promiſes and vows; which whoſoever can think compatible with mere Man, or any Creature, has no Notion of the horrid Sin of Idolatry. To make this ſtill the plainer, it is eſpecially to be obſerv'd, that in the Primitive Church two Things were requir'd of thoſe who were thought fit for Baptiſm, immediately before they receiv'd it; the renouncing Satan, and liſting under Chriſt. The Deſertion, or Renunciation, was made in theſe Words, *I renounce the Devil and all his Works, and his Worſhip*, &c. After this, immediately follow'd the Liſting with Chriſt; *I believe in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghoſt* (*a*). Both theſe Forms were receiv'd in the firſt Ages through all the Churches, ſo that it is not to be doubted but that they came from the Apoſtles. Now as by the one, they who came to Baptiſm, renounc'd the Worſhip of the Devil, and conſequently of all Idols and falſe Gods; ſo by the other, they gave themſelves up to the Worſhip of the only true God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. This is plainly gather'd from a Dialogue of *Lucian*'s (*b*), or ſome Contemporary of his, of a like Genius. There the Author, coeval with the firſt Succeſſion of the Apoſtles, a profane Man indeed, but one who well underſtood Chriſtianity, in a ſcoffing Way introduces

(*a*) *See the Apoſt. Conſtit.* Lib. 7. chap. 41. p. 379. *And* Cyril's *Myſtag. Catechiſm.*

(*b*) Luciani Opera: *Printed at* Hagenaw, 1535. Vol. 2. p. 932.

one

one *Triephon*, who was to perſonate a Chriſtian Doctor or Catechiſt, among other things, inſtructing his Catechumen in the Myſtery of the Trinity: For when the Catechumen asks, *By whom then ſhall I ſwear? Triephon* anſwers, *By the God which reigns on high, the Great, the Immortal, the Heavenly, the Son of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from the Father, One of Three, and Three of One: Suppoſe this to be* Jove, *think this your God.* Hence I ſay, we may gather, that the Proſelytes from *Gentiliſm* to the Chriſtian Church, were oblig'd, inſtead of their vain Deities they before worſhipp'd, to give themſelves up to the Worſhip and Obedience of the Trinity in Unity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as of their only God. *See this Place more largely explain'd, and ſufficiently defended from the Cavils of* Sandius, *in the Defence of the* Nicene Faith (*a*). Thus much may ſuffice for the firſt and moſt antient Creed.

4. Let us now proceed to the Explications of this Creed in *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*. *None of them*, ſays *Epiſcopius*, *contain the Profeſſion of this Filiation*; i. e. There is not any thing in any of theſe Expoſitions, which declares our Saviour to be the Son of God, otherwiſe than is conſiſtent with him, as only a mere Man, and not exiſting before *Mary*. But this is ſo falſe, that I wonder with what Judgment, Perſuaſion, or Conſcience, the learned Man could ſo boldly affirm it. I'll begin with (*b*) *Irenæus*. He tranſiently mentions the Rule of Faith, which every Chriſtian received in Baptiſm. He afterwards propounds and explains it variouſly, and in ſeveral places, but every where in the ſame Senſe. In all theſe Expoſitions, he plainly enough declares the divine Filiation of our Saviour, but in ſome, nothing can be clearer. Thus he gives us the Rule of Faith. (*c*) *For the Church, though diſpers'd through the whole World, to the Ends of the Earth, hath receiv'd from the Apoſtles, and their Diſci-*

(*a*) Sect. 2. chap 4. ſect. 11. (*b*) Lib. 1. chap. 1. *read the whole Chapter.* (*c*) Lib. 1. chap. 2. p. 50.

ples, this Faith in One God, the Father Almighty, who hath made the Heavens, the Earth, the Sea, and all things in them; and in One Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnate for our Salvation; and in the Holy Ghost, who preach'd by the Prophets the Dispensations of God, and his Coming, and his Generation of the Virgin, and his Passion, and Resurrection from the Dead, and the Assumption of our beloved Lord Jesus Christ in the Flesh into Heaven, and his coming from Heaven in the Glory of the Father, to gather all things together, to raise all human Flesh, that so every Knee in Heaven, in Earth, and under the Earth, may bow, according to the Good-pleasure of the invisible Father, to Christ Jesus our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King; and every Tongue shall confess to him, and he shall execute just Judgment in all things, &c. In this Exposition of the antient Creed, the Catholick Church, every where dispers'd, is said to believe in Christ, as the Son of God, incarnate for our Salvation; which Words are almost the very same with those in the *Constantinopolitan* Creed, and those in the most antient larger Oriental Creed, as we shall shew hereafter. In these Words, all that will, may see it signify'd that our Saviour did exist, and was the Son of God, in a Nature without Flesh, before he was made Man; that he then took upon him Flesh, or human Nature, out of Love to Mankind, that he might procure for us *eternal Salvation* (*a*). Nor can any one doubt what kind of Incarnation *Irenæus* believ'd, who is not entirely a Stranger to his Works. I will illustrate this Matter by *one Passage*, of the many which occur; in which, after a Recapitulation of those things disputed before, he thus writes (*b*): *Having plainly shewn, that the Word, which was with God in the Beginning, by whom all things were made, and who was always present to Mankind, that he was in the last Times, according to the Predetermination of the Father, united to his own Creature, being made passible Man; there is no room for their Contra-*

(*a*) Clem. Rom. Ep. 2. (*b*) Lib. 3, chap. 20. p. 282.

diction,

diction, who say, If therefore Christ was then born, he was not before. For we have shew'd that the Son of God did not then begin to be, having always existed with the Father; but when he was incarnate, and made Man, he took upon himself the sad, forlorn Condition of Man, compendiously procuring Salvation for us; that so what we had lost in Adam, *the Likeness and Similitude of God, we might recover in Christ Jesus. For since it was impossible that Man, who was once subdued, and thrown off by Disobedience, should be renew'd, and receive the Reward of Victory; and also impossible that he should obtain Salvation, who was fallen under Sin; the Son, who was the Word of God, descending from the Father, and perfecting the Dispensation of our Salvation, did both [for us.]* From hence it is very plain, what *Irenæus* meant by *believing in the Son of God, who was incarnate for our Salvation.* Moreover, in the Exposition of Faith before us, our Saviour is not only call'd the Son of God, but expresly God; which Name, according to (*a*) *Irenæus*, ought not to be given to any one absolutely, nor is so given in Scripture, but to him who is really God.

5. Further, *Irenæus*, in another (*b*) place, gives us the Rule of Faith, and explains it. There not only the Pre-existence of the Son before *Mary*, but also before all Creatures, and the Creation of all things by him, as by a Word, not extrinsick to God his Father, as all Creatures are, even Angels, but most intimate and co-essential with him, is very clearly expres'd. Read the place, and judge for your self: *Since then we hold the Rule of Faith, namely, that there is one God Almighty, who made all things by his Word, who fill'd and fram'd them out of nothing into Being, as the Scripture saith, The Heavens were made by the Word of the Lord, and all the Hosts of them by the Breath of his Mouth.* And again, *All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made. All things excepts nothing; but the Father made all things by him, whether visible or invisible, sensible, or in-*

(*a*) Lib. 3. chap 6. p. 246. (*b*) Lib. 1. chap. 19. p. 114.

telligible, temporary things for a certain End, or eternal; and since God made all these things, not by Angels, nor some Powers distinct in Sentiment from him, (for he wants nothing) but by his Word and Spirit makes, disposes, governs, and gives Existence to all, &c. *Therefore holding this Rule, though they use many and various Arguments, we easily prove that they have gone off from the Truth.* (*a*)

6. You may add to this a third Exposition of the antient Creed from the same *Irenæus*; where, intending to shew that the Tradition of Truth was not to be sought for in the Conventicles of Hereticks, but in the Catholick Church, he thus discourses (*b*): *Suppose the Apostles had left us no Scriptures, must we not have followed the Order of Tradition, which they committed to those with whom they entrusted the Churches? To this, many Nations of the* Barbarians, *who believe in Christ, assent, having Salvation written in their Hearts by the Spirit, without Letters or Ink, and diligently preserving the old Tradition, believing in One God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things in them, by Jesus Christ, the Son of God; who, out of his exceeding Love towards his own Creature, suffer'd himself to be born of a Virgin, uniting in himself Man to God, suffer'd under* Pontius Pilate, *rose again, was received into Glory, and shall come again the Saviour of those that are sav'd, and the* (*c*) Judge of those *that are* judg'd, *sending into eternal Fire those who change the Truth, and despise his Coming and his Father's. They who without Letters have believ'd this Faith, are, with respect to our Language,* Barbarians; *but with respect to Sentiment,* (*d*) Moral, *and Conversation, very wise through Faith, and please God, living in all Justice, Chastity, and Wisdom. To these Persons, if any one report*

(*a*) Consult the parallel Places of *Irenæus*, cited in the Defence of the *Nicene Creed*, Sect 2. chap. 5. sect. 7.

(*b*) Lib. 3. chap. 4. p. 242.

(*c*) *The Condemner of those that are to be condemn'd.* This Mistake in translating the Word κρινω, &c. frequently occurs among the old Interpreters, even in Scripture.

(*d*) *Consuetudinem*, ηθος.

the

the Inventions of Hereticks, ſpeaking to them in their own Language, they quickly ſhut their Ears, and fly as far as poſſible from them, not enduring to hear their blaſphemous Diſcourſe. In this Rule of Faith, Chriſt is ſaid to be that Son of God, by whom the Heaven, the Earth, the Sea, and all things in them were made; who, of his great Love to, and Compaſſion of the Work of his Hands, Mankind, himſelf condeſcended to be born Man of a Virgin, and thus join'd Man to God. *Irenæus* affirms (*a*) the Tradition of this Faith to be ſo univerſal and antient, that the very *Barbarians*, thoſe who had yet no Verſions of the Scripture, held it, as receiv'd at firſt from the Apoſtles, or their Diſciples, together with the Goſpel, of which it is indeed the greateſt part; and eſteem'd by all Catholick Chriſtians at that time ſo ſacred, that the *Barbarians* abhorr'd all Doctrine inconſiſtent with it, as impious Hereſy and Blaſphemy.

7. Let us now examine *Tertullian*'s Explications. In his Book *de Velandis Virginibus* the Rule of Faith is rather hinted by the way, than recited, and therefore not full and perfect. For there Chriſt is not ſo much as call'd our Lord, or the only begotten Son of God, but ſimply the Son of God. This notwithſtanding was enough for *Tertullian* to have ſaid of Chriſt by the way, who with the other antient Catholicks, always underſtood the Title of Son of God to be given to the Son in a ſublime Senſe. In that Rule of Faith there is no mention of the Conception of the Man Chriſt by the Holy Spirit, nor of the Holy Spirit himſelf. It is indeed my Opinion, that *Tertullian* had there an eſpecial regard to the Creed then uſed in the *African* Church, which was almoſt the ſame as the *Roman*: for the *Roman* Church agreed in her Creed with the *African* Churches, as (*b*) *Tertullian* ſays. Now the *Roman* Creed, tho larger than it is there given us by *Tertullian*, yet as in other reſpects, ſo in this Ar-

(*a*) Pag. 173. (*b*) Præſcript. adv. Heret. p. 215.

ticle

ticle of the Son of God, it was ſhorter than the Creeds of the *Eaſtern* Churches, for reaſons I ſhall take notice of by and by: But ſtill the Faith of the *Roman* and the *Eaſtern* Churches was always the ſame. They all confeſs'd the Article of the Son of God in the ſame extent of Meaning, tho in other Words. And this alſo *Tertullian* well knew.

8. Hence in another place noted by (*a*) *Epiſcopius*, where he delivers the Rule of Faith, he gives us this Article of the Son of God more full and explicite, deſcribing his Exiſtence very clearly, as not only before the bleſſed Virgin, but alſo before all Ages, and even before the Creation of all Things by him. For there, after he has ſaid, that that only ought to be controverted, which may be diſputed without prejudice to the Rule of Faith, he immediately ſubjoins the Rule in theſe Words: *That is the Rule of Faith, by which we profeſs what we believe, namely that, in which we believe that there is only one God, and no other beſides the Creator of the World, who made all Things of nothing by his Word firſt of all ſent forth; that the Word, call'd his Son, appear'd variouſly to the Patriarchs in the Name of God, always ſpoke in the Prophets, laſtly was brought down into the Virgin* Mary *by the Spirit and Power of God the Father, was made Fleſh in her Womb, and born Man of her, and is Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. Having ended the Creed, he adds, *This Rule inſtituted by Chriſt, as ſhall be prov'd, admits of no Queſtions, which are not heretical, and make the Perſons concern'd in them Hereticks.* What can be more clear or expreſs againſt *Epiſcopius*'s Aſſertion than theſe Words? The ſame Rule of Faith you have in (*b*) *another place* thus: *We*, ſays he, *believe that there is only one God, but under this Diſpenſation, which we call Oeconomy, that the Son his Word, who proceeded from him, by whom he made all Things, and without whom nothing was made, is of that one God; That he was ſent by the Father into the Virgin, and born of her, Man and God, the*

(*a*) Pag. 206. (*b*) Pag. 501.

Son

Son of Man and the Son of God, call'd Jesus Christ. Afterwards he adds: *That this Rule had come down from the beginning of the Gospel, even before any of the antient Hereticks, much more before the modern* Praxeas ; *both the late Rise* [Posteritas] *of all the Hereticks in general, and the Novelty of* Praxeas *in particular, but of Yesterday, will prove.*

From what has been said, it is abundantly manifest that *Episcopius's* Appeal to the Explications of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, with respect to the antient Creed, was rash and impudent.

CHAP. V.

Of the Creed, call'd the Apostles.

I COME now to the Creed call'd the Apostles, concerning which *Episcopius* says, *The very Creed call'd the Apostles, makes no mention at all of this Filiation, but is content with this short Form; I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son our Lord.* This is *Episcopius's* chief Argument; and after him, the Author of the *Irenicum* and *Sandius* have greatly urg'd it. The same our late Revivers of the *Arian* and *Socinian* Heresy have every where boasted of in their insipid Libels, and think themselves safe from the Charge of Heresy justly laid against them by the Catholicks, whilst intrench'd in this Strong-Hold.

2. In order to give a full Answer to this Argument, in which they so greatly glory and confide, I propose to demonstrate these four Positions. (1.) That the Creed call'd the Apostles, how conformable soever to their Doctrine, was not dictated or compos'd by the Apostles themselves in so many Words, in that Form and Method in which we now have it; but indeed is nothing else than the Creed of the *Roman* Church, which after the Year 400 was at last compleated in that Church, the Churches of the *East* in the mean time using another Creed. (2.) That the Church of *Rome* formerly

formerly might, and accordingly did uſe a more ſuccinct and ſhort Creed, than was neceſſary for the Churches of the *Eaſt*, theſe being diſturb'd with all kinds of Hereſies; when in the *Roman* Church not one Hereſy aroſe, which taught them to underſtand their ſhorter Confeſſion otherwiſe than according to its right Meaning, and the true Senſe of the Church. (3.) That this, notwithſtanding there really is in the *Roman* Creed a Profeſſion of this ſpecial Filiation of Jeſus Chriſt, namely, in theſe Words, *I believe in Jeſus Chriſt his* (*i. e.* God the Father's) *Only-begotten Son.* (4.) And laſtly, That in the Creed, or Rule of Faith, which prevail'd in the moſt antient Churches of the *Eaſt*, before the Council of *Nice*, this ſpecial Mode of Jeſus Chriſt's Filiation was expreſly taught and declar'd.

3. That very great Man *J. G. Voſſius*, hath abundantly proved the firſt Poſition, in his Diſſertations concerning the three Creeds: To the firſt of theſe Diſſertations, (not to do the ſame thing over again) I recommend my Reader.

The ſecond Poſition is confirm'd by the Teſtimony of *Ruffinus*, who thus prefaces his Expoſition of the Creed: *Before I begin to explain the Senſe of the Words, I can't but think it ſeaſonable to tell my Reader, that in divers Churches ſome Additions have been made in the Words. Now in the Church of* Rome, *this has not been done, which I ſuppoſe happen'd upon this account, becauſe no Hereſy hath taken its Riſe from thence, and becauſe they keep up an old Cuſtom, That thoſe who are to receive Baptiſm, ſhall publickly repeat the Creed in the Ears of the People, and they who were before them in the Faith did not bear the Addition of the leaſt Word: But in other places, as far as I can find, ſome Words ſeem to have been added by reaſon of ſome Hereticks, by which the Senſe of the novel Doctrine was thought to be excluded.* Thus he writes, and indeed it is plain, that the *Simonians*, *Cerinthians*, *Ebionites*, and the other Peſts of the primitive Church, did not ſpread their impious Tenets at *Rome*, but in the *Eaſt*, and eſpecially in *Aſia*. Hence *Ignatius* frequently

laſhes

laſhes thoſe Hereticks in his Epiſtles to the *Aſiatick* Churches; but writing to the *Romans*, takes notice of no Hereſy among them: Nay, he expreſly commends them in his *Salutations*, for their entire Purity of Faith, whilſt he calls them (*a*), *The United in every Command of Chriſt, fill'd with every Grace of God, without Diſtinction, and purify'd from every Spot, or ſtrain'd from all Dregs.* It is, I ſuppoſe, upon this account more particularly that *Tertullian* calls the *Roman* Church, a Church in Proſperity. O that this Proſperity, this Purity of the Faith, had continu'd always in it! but alas, now we may cry out in the Words of the Prophet, *How is the faithful City become an Harlot!*

4. I come now to the third Poſition, and intend to enlarge upon it. Now it is eaſy to prove that Chriſt, in the *Roman* Creed, is called the Only-begotten Son of God, with reſpect to that Divine Nature of his, in which he exiſted not only before *Mary*, but before all Ages, from God the Father, and with him. This Proof we will bring, (1.) From the Holy Scripture, in which the Word *Only-begotten* is attributed to Chriſt, (for we can't ſuſpect that the Church underſtood the Word otherwiſe than the Scripture, from which they borrow'd it.) (2.) From the Force and Propriety of the Word. (3.) From the Order and Context of the Creed: and, (4.) From the conſtant Senſe, and perpetual Interpretation of the Catholick Church.

(1.) As for the Scripture, the firſt Place in which this Word is apply'd to Chriſt, is *John* i. 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, as of the Only-begotten of the Father.* Here it is plain, that the *Only-begotten of the Father* is he who alone was begotten of him. Some Perſons would refer the Words [*of the Father*] to the Words [*the Glory*] ſo as to read, [*And we beheld his Glory* (given him, or receiv'd by him) *from, or of the Father.*] But beſides the

(*a*) Tom. 2. P. A. p. 26. (*b*) Pag. 215.

Confu-

Confusion in the Words thus construed, there are not indeed enough to express this Meaning; a Violence which should never be offer'd without Necessity. Again, the Expression [*the Only-begotten of, or from the Father*] seems to me more significantly to declare the Divine Generation of the Son from the Father, than [*the Only-begotten of the Father*] the Particle [*of*, or *from*] suggesting that he is so the Only Son of God the Father, as that he alone is indeed begotten of and from the very Father. Moreover, the *(a)* Apostle gives this Title to the Word, namely, *to him, who was in the Beginning with God, who was God, and by whom all things were made.* Hence it is plain, that Christ was call'd the Only-begotten of or from the Father, in respect of his Divine Nature, by which he existed before Ages. Lastly, The Observation of *Grotius* is not impertinent, that St. *John* aims at the Gnosticks here, who made the Word to be one, the Only-begotten another, and Jesus a third; and who reckon'd the Only-begotten among their *Æons*, born before this World. The Apostle therefore shews, that our Lord Christ is the only true Word, and the true Only-begotten Son of, or from the Father, as being alone begotten by him before Ages. To the same purpose is this Word understood in *(b)* other places, even in *(c)* *Episcopius*'s Judgment, who reasons thus upon those places: *It is certain that the Love of God towards us is greatly exalted* [in those places] *in that he sent his Only-begotten Son into the World, and gave him up to the Death of the Cross, to save Sinners, the Children of Wrath. But if the Son of God denotes no more than Jesus, born of the Virgin, we can't see so clearly why this Love should be so greatly extoll'd, as if it denotes the Son, whom he begat before Ages. For the Son, born of the Virgin, was therefore born of her, that he might die for Sinners. Now, where was the extraordinary Love of God, in giving up*

(*a*) *St.* John's *Gospel*, i. 1, 2. (*b*) John iii. 16. *and the 4th, v. 9.* (*b*) Episcopii Tom. 1. p. 337.

that

that Son to Death, who was begot of the Virgin, by his Pleasure, and conceived of the Holy Spirit for that purpose? But if you conceive it to be the Son of God, who was begotten of the Father before Ages, who was under no necessity of being sent into the World, whose Dignity was greater than that he should be sent, or come in the Flesh, much less die, who seemed dearer to the Father, than that he would force him upon so much Calamity; then indeed the Splendor and Glory of the Divine Love towards Mankind shines forth greatly. Thus *Episcopius*. That he had wrote so always! Indeed it will be very clear to any one who seriously considers the Matter, that according to the *Arian* and *Socinian* Scheme, God rather shew'd his Love towards this Son of his, than towards us Men. For he who is called Christ, was chosen to this Grace and Favour by the Good-pleasure of God only, that after a short Obedience perform'd upon Earth, of a mere Man, according to the *Socinians*, of a mere mutable Creature, according to the *Arians*; he should become God, have Divine Honours paid him, not only by us Men, but by Angels and Arch-Angels, and even obtain Power and Dominion over all other Creatures. Further, the Love of the Only-begotten Son of God towards us Men (so greatly celebrated in Scripture, and especially in the (*a*) Epistle to the *Ephesians*) does not appear, unless we conceive him to be the Son of God, who was begotten of the Father before Ages, *by whom all things were made, who for us Men and our Salvation, descended from Heaven, and was incarnate*, &c. But upon this Supposition, as *Irenæus* speaks, we clearly see the most eminent Love of God towards his own Work. This by the bye. Now I can't see how we can reconcile *Episcopius* to himself. In the Places of Scripture, where Christ is called the Only-begotten Son of God, he contends that the Only-begotten Son must signify that Son, whom the Father begat before Ages, and therefore that in that

(*a*) Chap. 3. ver. 18, & 19.

Title

Title is contain'd this ſpecial Mode of Chriſt's Filiation: But in the (*a*) Creed, extracted from the Scriptures, in which we profeſs our Faith in Chriſt, the Only-begotten Son of God, he abſolutely denies that this ſpecial Mode of Filiation is contain'd.

5. (2.) It may be prov'd from the Force and Propriety of the Word, that Chriſt is call'd the Only-begotten in the Creed, with reſpect to his Divine Nature. For he is called Only-begotten, who alone, and not in a Community of Sonſhip, is Son; *i. e.* whom the Father hath alone, who, in the way in which he is Son, hath no Brother: Moreover, who is Son by Nature, begotten of or from the Father, not a made or adopted Son. Now Chriſt can't be called the Only-begotten Son of God, unleſs with reſpect to his Divine Generation: For the Title does not belong to him as Man. To make this the more clear, we will conſider the four Ways, in which Chriſt, as Man, is in Scriptures (according to (*b*) *Epiſcopius*) by way of Eminence, call'd God.

The 1*ſt* is, becauſe, as Man, he was conceived of the *Holy Ghoſt*. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee; therefore that Holy One which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the Son of God.* *Anſw.* At preſent, I ſhall ſay nothing of (*c*) *Juſtin Martyr*'s and *Tertullian*'s Interpretation of the Place, who expound [*the Holy Spirit*] and [*the Power of the Higheſt*] of the Word himſelf; nor yet of *Novatian*'s Criticiſm, who places an Emphaſis upon the Particle [*And.*] This is my Anſwer, Tho' Chriſt be there called the Son of God, upon account of his Conception by the Holy Ghoſt in the Womb of the Virgin, as Man; yet he is not there called the Only, or the Only-begotten Son of God. But (ſays *Epiſco-*

(*a*) *He muſt defend the Creed, and depreciate the Scriptures; and he may as well do it, as Dr.* Whitby *prefers the Authority of* Clemens Romanus *before St.* Paul. p. 16. Mod. Diſquiſ.

(*b*) Epiſcop. Tom. 1. p. 335.

(*c*) Juſtin. pag. 75. Tert. p. 515. Novat. chap. 29.

pius)

pius) this Eminence (whereby he was form'd in the Virgin's Womb, by the Power of God) is proper to the Man Jesus Christ, and there never was, nor ever will be the like. I say that is not true. For the Flesh of Christ was conceiv'd and form'd in the Virgin's Womb, by the Divine Power, without a Father. And was not the first Man form'd by the Hands of God himself, without either Father or Mother? And is he not therefore expressly call'd the (*a*) *Son of God*? The Eminence then of Jesus Christ, as Only-begotten Son, is not in this: For in this the first *Adam* may in some sort be said to be superior to the second, because made by God, without Father or Mother, whereas this had only no Father. (*b*) *Philo Judæus* elegantly describes the illustrious Generation of our first Parent, in these Words: *Who, for the Nobility of his Generation, was not to be compar'd with any Mortal, being form'd into a bodily Image, by the Hands of God, with the utmost plastick Art; and having a Soul given him, not from any created Being, God breathing into him as much of the Divine Power as mortal Nature was capable of. Was not that the Excellence of Nobility, with which that, of all the rest which were named, could not be compar'd? Their Glory was the Nobility of their Ancestors. Their Ancestors were Men, mortal, corruptible, and their Prosperity unstable; and, for the most part, of short Continuance: but no Mortal was his Father, nor any one the Cause of his Being but God.* Hence St. *Irenæus* says, the Man Christ, the second *Adam*, was made like the first in his Generation, not indeed altogether, but as much so as the Oeconomy of our Salvation would permit. For after he had (*c*) observ'd, that as the Man first form'd of the Virgin Earth (not yet manur'd or till'd, as *Tertullian* interprets) was made by the Hands of God himself; so Christ, the Renewer of the first *Adam*, was made, as to his Humanity, of the Virgin *Mary*, by the Holy Spirit: a little after he adds; *Now if he was taken*

(*a*) Luke 3. *ver.* 38. (*b*) Ed. Turneb. Paris, 1552. p. 621.
(*c*) Lib. 3. chap. 31. p. 298, & 299.

from the Earth, and God form'd him, it became him who was to gather together into himself Man, made by God, to have a Similitude of Generation with him. Why then did not God take the Duſt of the Earth again, but cauſed him to be made of Mary ? *That there ſhould not be another Formation, another Being to be ſaved, but that he the ſame* [*Man*] *ſhould be renew'd in his own Similitude* (*a*). The very great Excellence then of our Saviour's Filiation, by which he is called the Only-begotten, or the Only Son of God, lies not in this, that he was produced of the Virgin *Mary*, by the Power of the Higheſt, without having a Man to his Father; for in this the firſt Man was equal, in ſome ſort ſuperior to him: but in a far more ſublime Generation, namely, that in which he was the Son of God, not only before *Mary*, but alſo before *Adam*, and indeed before all Ages. If you obſerve upon the Generation of them both, certainly the ſecond no way excels the firſt, as mere Man, but in this greateſt Difference imaginable, as God and Man. Whatſoever the Addition is, by which the human Nature of the ſecond *Adam* exceeds the firſt, is all owing to that Union by which the Soul of Chriſt is, by the greateſt and moſt intimate (*b*) *Communion* imaginable, (by ſuch a Communion, as that another more cloſe can't be) joined to the Divine Perſon of the Only-begotten Son of God. Thus (to obſerve this by the way) the divine (*c*) Apoſtle makes the Compariſon between the firſt and ſecond *Adam*: *The firſt Man is of the Earth earthy, the ſecond Man is the Lord from Heaven.* Some there are indeed, but vain and abſurd Men, who will have the Words [*from Heaven*] applied to the ſecond *Adam*, as born of the Virgin *Mary*, by an abſolutely divine and celeſtial Power, without a Father; for thus, as we have ſeen before, it may be ſaid of the firſt *Adam*. What the Meaning is of thoſe Words [*from Heaven*] in oppoſition to [*of the Earth earthy*] is very plain from the Saying of (*d*) *John* the Baptiſt,

(*a*) Pag. 321. (*b*) Origen. (*c*) 1 Cor. 15. *ver.* 47.
(*d*) *St.* John's *Goſpel*, chap 3. ver. 31. *Compare with this*, c. 1. v. 30.

com-

comparing himself, as a Son of *Adam*, with the Lord Christ: *He that comes from above, is above all; he that is of the Earth is earthy, and speaks earthy things; he that comes from Heaven, is above all.* Besides, I don't doubt but that [*the Man, the Lord from Heaven*] is the same which is called by the Cabalistick *Jews* [*that* Adam *from above which is bless'd*] by which Periphrasis they certainly meant the true God. For indeed what the Cabalists taught concerning the Marriage of that *Adam* from above, who is blessed, with the Congregation of *Israel*, mystically signify'd by the Conjunction of the earthy *Adam* and *Eve*, is manifestly refer'd by the (*a*) Apostle to the Union of Christ and the Church. Now those other Words of the (*b*) Apostle must be understood in the same Sense: *The first Man was made a living Soul, the last Man was made a quickning Spirit.* The first Man was made, *i. e.* according to a well-known *Idiom* of the *Hebrew* Language, was a living Soul; the last was a quickning Spirit. The Sense is, the first Man was only Man, the second more than Man, even a Spirit which gave Life, *i. e.* God. The Spirit in Christ, as we have often observ'd, doth frequently in Holy Scripture, and the Writers of the first Age, denote the divine Nature in him. Now it is the Property of the Divine Nature (as is here said) to give Life to Men, upon which account Christ is elsewhere said to be the (*c*) *Prince of Life*, and *Life itself.* He is the Author of all our Life, natural, spiritual, and moral, as (*d*) *Clemens Alexandrinus* has elegantly express'd it: *The Word, which in the Beginning, after the Formation, gave Life as the Creator, taught afterward to live well as an Instructor; that after that, as God, he might bestow eternal Life.* As this Interpretation rises necessarily from the Words of the Text, so it is very agreeable to the Context. For the Apostle had said, that there were two Bodies, one

(*a*) Eph. v. ver. 32. (*b*) 1 Cor. chap. 15. ver. 45.
(*c*) Acts iii. 15. John i. 4. (*d*) P. 4, & 5.

animal, another ſpiritual, which he here ſhews from their contrary Cauſes. For as we receiv'd theſe our animal and mortal Bodies from the firſt *Adam*, a mere Man, and conſiſting of a Body, in its own nature at leaſt animal and mortal; ſo we ſhall hereafter receive ſpiritual Bodies from Chriſt, the ſecond *Adam*, who is more than Man, in whom is the Divine Nature, and who is the Fountain of all Life. The Change of our vile Bodies into the Likeneſs of his glorious Body, to be perform'd by Chriſt in the Reſurrection, is alſo (*a*) attributed to his Almighty Power; and this is not compatible with him but as God. The Interpretation which *Grotius* has lick'd up from the *Socinians*, that Chriſt was then only made an enlivening Spirit, after he was rais'd from the Dead, and had aſcended into Heaven, is vain. For, (1.) It is very plain the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the primigenial Nature of them both, and not of either of them, as to what they were afterwards made. He then who was not always an enlivening Spirit, never could be made ſo. The made God is one of thoſe Monſters which the *Arians* and *Socinians* have bleſs'd us with, odious to ſound Reaſon and true Religion. Laſtly, It is certain Chriſt was an enlivening Spirit, even before his Reſurrection; for as ſuch, he recall'd his Body from (*b*) *Death to Life.* Hence *Ignatius*, a Diſciple of the Apoſtles, ſays of Chriſt, *He truly ſuffer'd, as he alſo truly rais'd himſelf up.* The Reſurrection of the Body of Chriſt from the Dead, is alſo in Scripture aſcrib'd to God the Father: and what then? Whatſoever the Son doth, he doth it from the Father; and whatſoever the Father doth, he doth it by the Son. Hence alſo the Creation of all things is attributed to the Father and the Son, becauſe the Father made all things by the Son. But, to return from this brief Digreſſion, the ſupreme and eſpecial Eminence of our Lord's Filiation is ſo far from conſiſting in his Nativity of the Virgin *Mary*, that on

(*a*) Phil. iii. 21. (*b*) John ii. ver. 19.

the

the contrary, that very Nativity is to be eſteem'd a wonderful Condeſcenſion. This, if we will indeed follow the Holy Spirit, the ſacred Writings plainly and frequently teach: nor does *Epiſcopius* deny it. Thus the Catholick Church, from the Times of the Apoſtles themſelves, always believ'd. Hence *Juſtin*, afore-cited, ſays, *That this is the Faith of Chriſtians concerning Chriſt, namely, they own Chriſt to be the Son of God, who was before* Lucifer *and the Moon, and who condeſcended to be made Fleſh, and born of a Virgin, of the Seed of* David. We have before cited *Irenæus*, affirming, that all Chriſtians every where profeſs'd in their Rule of Faith to believe in the Son of God, by whom the Father created all things; and who, of his very great Love to his own Creature, endur'd to be born of a Virgin, *&c.* Hence the ſix famous Biſhops, in the (*a*) *Epiſtle from the Synod of* Antioch, which they wrote to *Paul* of *Samoſata*, not without the Conſent of the whole Synod, pronounce, with the greateſt Aſſurance, that this was the conſentient Doctrine and Faith of the Catholick Church. Their Words are theſe: *In the whole Church of God, he* [*Chriſt*] *is believ'd to be God, emptying himſelf of his Equality with God; and Man, of the Seed of* David. *Laſtly*, Hence it is, that to this day, maugre the *Arians* and *Socinians*, the Church does, and always will ſing, *Thou art the King of Glory, O Chriſt; thou art the everlaſting Son of the Father; when thou tookeſt upon thee to deliver Man, thou didſt not abhor the Virgin's Womb.* Thus much for the firſt Mode, in which *Epiſcopius* has obſerv'd that Chriſt, as Man, is in Scripture call'd the Son of God.

6. The ſecond is, *That Jeſus Chriſt, upon account of that Office of Mediator, by the ſpecial Command of the Father laid upon him, is call'd the Son of God* (*b*). I anſwer, (1.) That Chriſt can't, upon this account, be properly call'd a Son begotten of God, much leſs Only-begotten. He who is thus a Son, is a Son not

(*a*) Bibl. Patr. Tom. 2. Vide Valeſium ad chap. 30. Lib. 7. Euſeb. (*b*) John x. ver. 35, 36.

by Nature, but by Grace. (2.) That in this ſenſe Chriſt had many Brethren, all who were anointed Kings or Prophets by God; all who were ſent upon any ſpecial Command to the People of God. In this kind of Filiation, Chriſt may be called the chief, principal, and far the moſt excellent Son of God, but not the Only-begotten. But, (3.) Whoever examines the Text cited, thoroughly, will find that Chriſt did not there call himſelf, or would only be believ'd to be the Son of God, becauſe he came from God as an Ambaſſador ſent to Men, and furniſh'd with extraordinary Powers; but upon a far more exalted Ground, namely, as he was with God the Father before he was ſent into the World, as his true, genuine, coeſſential Son, and indeed very God. Nor was *Epiſcopius* ignorant of this, for (*a*) elſewhere he has drawn an Argument from this place for the divine Filiation of Jeſus, againſt the *Socinians*. But it may be worth our while to enlarge upon this place, and prove this matter more clearly than he has done. It is manifeſt, that our Saviour, in the Words (*b*) before, had ſo ſpoken to the *Jews*, that they neither underſtood nor believ'd that he ſaid any thing elſe, but that he was God. Theſe are their Words, *For a good Work we ſtone thee not, but for Blaſphemy, becauſe that thou being a Man, makeſt thy ſelf God.* He had often called his Father God, by way of Diſtinction; and a little before he had ſaid, that he and the Father are one. Now it is diligently to be obſerv'd, that Chriſt made not that Anſwer which he muſt have made, if he had not known himſelf to be truly God, namely, that he was not really God, nor had ever arrogated that Title to himſelf; (for by this Anſwer, could he have truly made it, he might eaſily have appeaſed the Anger of the *Jews*, and it was alſo incumbent upon him, with Indignation, to reject ſo plain an Accuſation of Blaſ-

(*a*) Vol. 2. p. 2. Bodecherus inepticns, p. 52. *it is hinted.*
(*b*) *From* ver. 25. to ver. 30.

phemy)

Blaſphemy) but on the contrary, clearly ſignify'd, that he was the very Son of God, and conſequently God. For he defends himſelf againſt the *Jews* theſe two ways, (1.) By an Argument from their (*a*) Law: *Jeſus anſwer'd them, is it not written in your Law, I have ſaid, ye are Gods?* Which place, as *Grotius* has well obſerv'd, ſeems to be meant of the Judges of the Great Synedrium. From this place, Chriſt thus defends himſelf: *If he hath called thoſe Gods, to whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture can't be broken; do ye ſay that I blaſpheme, whom the Father hath ſanctify'd, and ſent into the World, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God?* This kind of Argument, from the leſs to the greater, proceeds thus: If thoſe, who having nothing divine in them, namely, the Judges of the Great Synedrium, to whom the Pſalmiſt there ſpeaks, (for I am of *Capellus*'s mind) are called Gods for this reaſon only, that they have in them a certain imperfect Image of divine Power and Authority; how much more may I be called the Son of God, and even God, who am the natural Son of God, and beſides in an extraordinary manner authoriz'd by God the Father? Chriſt indeed hath not expreſly ſaid this, but he hath plainly intimated it in theſe Words, [*that I, whom the Father hath ſanctify'd and ſent into the World.*] Here (obſerve) he ſays not [*whom God hath ſanctify'd*] but [*whom the Father hath ſanctify'd*] hinting that his ſpecial Reaſon for calling God his Father, was not that he was ſanctify'd by God, *i. e.* ſet apart, and deſign'd for the Buſineſs laid upon him, and ſent into the World; but on the other hand, that he was ſanctify'd and ſent into the World by God already his Father. Beſides, I don't doubt but that there is a great deal of reaſon in the Emphaſis (*b*) *Maldonate* lays upon the Words [*ſent into the World,*] in which is ſignify'd that Chriſt is the Son of God, born not after the manner of others upon Earth, but in Heaven, and from thence

(*a*) Pſalm. lxxxii. ver. 6. (*b*) In locum.

ſent into this World. For thus the Lord, ſpeaking to his Diſciples, more clearly explains himſelf, (*a*) *I came forth from the Father, and came into the World, and again I leave the World, and go to the Father.* In which Words any Man, but a ſagacious *Socinian*, may perceive that Chriſt intended, that he, in his better Nature, was in Heaven with God, and that as his Father, before he firſt came into this World, that is, was *made Man.* Our Lord proceeds with this Defence, and eſtabliſhes the Divinity he had in common with the Father, by another Argument from his Miracles: (*b*) *If I do not the Works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do them, though ye believe me not, believe the Works, that ye may know, and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.* As if he ſhould have ſaid, becauſe I called myſelf by way of Diſtinction the Son of God the Father, and ſaid that I and the Father were one, ye accuſe me of Blaſphemy. This indeed you might be thought to do very juſtly, if I aſſerted this Divinity in Words only, not in Deeds; but now that I do the ſame Works of Omnipotence with the Father, why do ye not believe me to be of the ſame Nature with him? I don't deſire to bear Witneſs of myſelf, but at leaſt by my Works to perſuade you, that the Father is in me, and I in him; that is, that I and the Father are one, as I ſaid before.

Hence it is clear that our Lord, when the *Jews* accuſed him of Blaſphemy, for calling himſelf the Son of God, by way of Diſtinction, and thereby plainly intimating that he was God, in his Anſwer, was ſo far from denying the Crime objected, that he prov'd it by the ſtrongeſt Arguments. This the *Jews* well underſtood, dull and ſtupid enough, yet able to condemn thoſe wiſeſt of Mortals, the *Socinians*, of the groſſeſt Blindneſs: For they, inſtead of abſolving him for this Anſwer, were ready to ſeize him immediately as

(*a*) John xvi. 28. *compare* John iii. 13. (*b*) John x. 37, & 38.

a Blaſphemer. For it follows, (*a*) *Then ſought they again to apprehend him, but he eſcaped out of their hands.* When the Evangeliſt ſays [*then,*] he intimates that the *Jews* again provok'd by thoſe very Words which our Saviour had ſpoken in his Defence, would have apprehended him, that having drawn him out of the Temple, (*b*) where he had this Diſcourſe with them, they might ſtone him. *Grotius*'s Comment is quite wrong, where he will have it, that the *Jews*, after our Lord had clear'd himſelf beyond exception of the Blaſphemy charg'd upon him, left off the Thoughts of ſtoning him as a Blaſphemer, and endeavour'd to deliver him up to the Government, to find or make ſome other Accuſation againſt him. For the *Jews* did not therefore intend to apprehend Chriſt, that they might bring him before the Sanhedrin, but that they might carry him off to ſome place, where they could murder him without Sacrilege. The Temple, within the Verge of which our Saviour ſtood and talk'd, was every way ſacred, and not to be polluted by any (*c*) Slaughter, or Blood. Beſides, the Word [*again*] plainly ſhews, that the *Jews* were for repeating the Attempt they had before made, to (*d*) ſtone him. In that place alſo the Word [*again*] occurs, and manifeſtly denotes another time alſo, when the *Jews*, upon a like Occaſion, would have ſtoned (*e*) Chriſt. For there alſo the *Jews* rightly thought, from our Saviour's Diſcourſe, when he ſaid that he was (*f*) before *Abraham*, that he attributed to himſelf a certain Nature, in which he was before *Abraham*, that is, a Divine Nature, and therefore called himſelf God.

7. I proceed to the third manner, in which *Epiſcopius* ſays Chriſt, as Man, is in Scripture called God, namely, *Becauſe he was raiſed from the Dead to Life immortal by the Father, and, as it were, begotten again of the*

(*a*) Ver. 39. (*b*) Ver. 23. (*c*) *Compare* Acts xxi. 30.
(*d*) Ver. 31. (*e*) John viii. ver. 59. (*f*) Ver. 58.

Womb

Womb of the Earth, (a) without any Mother. I answer, Christ could not this way be called the Only-begotten Son of God, for in this sense, all good Men, who rise again, are called Sons of God, because Sons of the *(b) Resurrection.* The Man Christ may, upon account of his Resurrection, be called the First-begotten from the Dead, and indeed he is expresly so called, *(c) because* he, the first of all the Dead, return'd from Death to Life, never to die any more. Besides, in the places where Christ in Scripture is call'd Only-begotten, God the Father is said to have sent his Only-begotten Son into the World, and to have *(d) given him to Men.* Therefore he was the Only-begotten Son of God when he first came into the World, not then only, after he was by Death taken out of it, then raised from the Dead, and about to ascend into Heaven. But the Apostle St. *Paul*, in the place cited by *Episcopius*, applies the Words of *David, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee*, to the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead. Now it is to be observ'd against the modern *Artemonites*, that this is not so to be understood, as tho' he then only began to be the Son of God in the most excellent Sense, and to be begotten of him by and after the Resurrection; but that by the Resurrection, he was the most powerfully declar'd and exhibited as the True and Only-begotten Son of God. For this is the way of the Scripture, to say that things are then made, when they are manifested and discover themselves. Hence *(e) Justin Martyr*, (as we have elsewhere observ'd) upon citing this place, adds, *Then saying that he was born to Men, when he was going to be known of them.* Thus indeed St. *Paul* interprets himself *concerning his Son, made of the Seed of* David, *after the Flesh, and declared the Son of God with Power, (f) after the Holy Spirit, by the Resurrection from the*

(*a*) Acts xiii. ver. 32, & 33. (*b*) Luke xx. ver. 36.
(*c*) Col. i. ver. 18. (*d*) John iii. 16. 1 Ep. *of St.* John, iv. 9.
(*e*) Pag. 316. (*f*) Rom. i. ver. 3, 4.

Dead.

Dead. Here *Chryſoſtom* interprets ὁρισθέντος, which we tranſlate *declar'd*, by *ſhewn, manifeſted, judg'd*, by the Opinion and Suffrage of all. To the ſame ſenſe the *Greek Scholiaſts*, the *Syriac* and *Æthiopic* Verſions. The *Latin* Interpreter alone, contrary to the Faith of all the *Greek* Copies, renders [*who is predeſtinated the Son of God*] as though it had been written προορισθέντος. But what a ſort of a Son of God was Chriſt declar'd and proved to be by the Reſurrection? No doubt, a Son of God co-eſſential to his Father, and therefore very God. For as in this place [*according to the Fleſh*] denotes the human Nature of Chriſt, ſo [*according to the Spirit of Holineſs*] denotes his divine Nature. Now as Chriſt, according to the Fleſh, is ſaid to be of the Seed of *David*, *i. e.* the Son of *David*; ſo he is called the Son of God, according to the Spirit of Holineſs. We have obſerv'd ſo often before, that the Spirit in Chriſt, eſpecially when oppos'd to the Fleſh, denotes his divine Nature, that it is needleſs to repeat it. Nor ought it to ſeem ſtrange that Chriſt, as the Son of God, and God, is here called the Spirit of Holineſs, an Appellation generally given to the third Perſon of the Divinity; for the ſame divine, ſpiritual and holy Nature, is common to every Perſon of the Trinity. Hence we have obſerved, that *Hermas*, a Contemporary of St. *Paul*, has expreſly called the divine Perſon of the Son of God an Holy Spirit; and that *Ignatius*, an Apoſtolical Man, and a ſtudious Imitator of St. *Paul*'s Style, has called him the *immaculate Spirit* (*a*). Beſides, the ſame *Ignatius* ſeems to have had reſpect to this Text of St. *Paul*'s, and to have given us a Paraphraſe of it in that illuſtrious Place, more than once cited by me: *There is one Phyſician, carnal and ſpiritual, made and unmade, God made in the Fleſh*; (*or as* Gelaſius, Athanaſius, *and* Theodoret, *God in Man*) *the true Life in Death, both of* Mary, *and of God.* Here, as in St. *Paul*, Chriſt is ſaid to have

(*a*) *Def. N. C.* Sect. 1. chap. 2. ſect. 5.

two

two Natures, a carnal and a ſpiritual: According to the carnal Nature, or, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, according to the Fleſh, Chriſt is ſaid to be begotten, or made, and mortal Man: According to the ſpiritual Nature, or, as St. *Paul*, according to the Spirit of Holineſs, he is unbegotten, or unmade, the true Life, and conſequently God; as carnal, of *Mary*, *i. e.* the Seed of *David*; as ſpiritual, of God, *i. e.* the *Son of God* (*a*).

8. We are now come to the fourth and laſt manner, in which *Epiſcopius* will have it, that the Man Chriſt is called the Son of God in Scripture; namely, *As Jeſus Chriſt, being raiſed from the Dead, was made entire Heir of all things in his Father's Houſe; and therefore Lord of all the Heavenly Poſſeſſions, and of his Father's Miniſters, i. e.* of all *the Angels* (*b*). I anſwer, That Chriſt could not properly be called the Son of God upon this account only, much leſs then his Only-begotten Son. For an *Heir* is not neceſſarily the true natural Son of him, whoſe Heir he is, much leſs his Only-begotten Son; becauſe a Relation, or a Stranger, may be made Heir (*c*). Further, our Lord, as I ſaid a little before, was the Only-begotten Son of God when he was firſt ſent into this World by his Father, therefore not then only made the Only-begotten Son of God, when taken up again into his Father's Heavenly Manſion, and made Heir and Lord of all.

Now as for the place refer'd to in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, Chriſt is not there called the Son of God, much leſs God, becauſe made Heir of all; but on the

(*a*) *Compare* 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, 20.

(*b*) Heb. i. ver. 5.

(*c*) *The Author of the Queries, though prolix upon this Head, has not thought fit to take any notice of Dr.* Bull's *Arguments. In this, and the three preceding Modes, in which our Lord is by* Epiſcopius *affirm'd to be the Only-begotten Son, that Gentleman has exactly follow'd him, without ſo much as a Stricture upon that ſound Reaſoning the Biſhop has uſed in his Confutation. If his Book did not betray the contrary, a Man would ſcarce believe he had any Acquaintance with this excellent Piece. Compare the Anſwer to the Queries,* p. 65, *&c. with our Author.*

other

other hand, he is said to be made Heir of all, because the Son first; the Son, I say, by whom God the Father made the Worlds, and who was before Ages. The Words are these: *God in these last Days hath spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath made Heir of all things, by whom also he made the World.* Here the *Socinian* Comment is monstrous, namely, that God is therefore said to have made the Worlds by his Son, because he reform'd Mankind by him, and brought them into a new State. A Man may safely swear, not one of the *Hebrews*, to whom this Epistle was written, understood the Author's Words in this sense; or ever dreamt that by [*the Worlds*] was only meant Mankind, much less only that part of them to whom the Light of the Gospel had then appear'd. The Words, which we render *Worlds*, are, by an *Hebraism*, used for the whole created Universe. Thus again in another place, (*a*) *By Faith we perceive that the Worlds were made by the Word of God.* Nor can you, I believe, either in Holy Scripture, or any profane *Greek* Author, find the Word understood in their Sense. In the *Jewish* Liturgy, God is frequently called *God, or Lord of Ages*, i. e. *of all created things.* They, as the Criticks in that Literature observe, make a three-fold *Æon*, Age, or World: The first, the inferior, the elementary Region; the second, the middle, the celestial Orbs; the third, the superior, the Mansion of the Divine Majesty and the Angels, which St. *Paul* calls the (*b*) *Third Heaven.* The Divine Author then intended to teach us that God the Father made all these *Æons*, Ages, Worlds, by his Son. This he again expressly affirms in the same (*c*) Chapter, where he says, that the Words of the Psalmist were spoken to the Son of God: *Thou Lord in the Beginning hast founded the Earth, the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands. They shall perish, but thou endurest; they all shall wax old as a Garment, and as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be*

(*a*) Chap. 11. ver. 3. (*b*) 2 Cor. xii. 2. (*c*) Ver. 10, 11, 12.

changed:

changed: but thou art the same, and thy Years shall not fail. What do the Hereticks again with these Words? As they used to do. They deny the Paragraph is applied to the Son of God, and say only that part of it, which speaks of what is not yet done, but future, namely, the Destruction of the World, is by the Author accommodated to him. But (not to say that it is the plain Design of the Author, to shew the Excellency of the Son of God from his present actual Attributes; nor to add, that both the Creation and Destruction of the World are alike the Work of a Divine Power, and not communicable to any Creature) what is this, if not impudently to contradict the Divine Author to his Face? Now, they say, it is too too plain, that these Words of the Psalmist are spoken to the supreme God, namely, to God the Father. Grant it, what then? Does it thence follow, that they are not also spoken to the Son of God? On the contrary, whatsoever is spoken to God the Father, as the Creator of the World, is spoken also to the Son, because God the Father, as the Author had said before, created all things by the Son. Moreover, tho' that Psalm seem to be nothing else than the Supplication of the People or Prophet for rebuilding *Jerusalem*, raised by the *Chaldæans*; yet (according to the generality of Interpreters) as the earthly *Jerusalem* is a Figure of the Church of Christ, so these things which are spoken of the rebuilding the earthly *Jerusalem*, are mystically to be refer'd to the building the spiritual and heavenly *Jerusalem*, the Church, the City and Kingdom of Christ. For the following Passages of this Psalm are not perfectly fulfill'd, except in Christ and his Church. (*a*) *Thou shalt arise and have Mercy upon* Zion, *for it is time to have Mercy upon her, yea the time is come.* And, *The* Gentiles *shall fear thy Name, O Lord, and all the Kings of the Earth thy Glory; for the Lord hath built* Zion, *and shall be seen in his Majesty.* And,

(*a*) Psalm cii.

The

The Lord looked down from Heaven upon the Earth, &c. And, *When the People met together, and the Kings also to serve the Lord.* Wherefore the other things also spoken of God belong to Christ. And indeed, if this was not plain from the Context, we must yield to the Authority of an inspir'd Writer. I will yet add, that the literal Sense of the Psalm, as it relates to the freeing God's People from the *Babylonish* Captivity, belongs to Christ, because he, as the Word and Son of God, always existing with God his Father, presided over and provided for the Church from the Beginning; yea, by his Providence, ruled and govern'd all created things. Nor can we think (as *Tertullian* tells us, in concert with the whole Church of Christ) that only the Works of the World were made by the Son, but also the things transacted by God since the Creation. Hence (*a*) St. *Paul* plainly teaches, that it was Christ who presided over the People of *Israel* in the Wilderness, after he had brought them out of the *Egyptian* Bondage, and who went before, and led them by the Hand, as it were, into the *Promised Land.*

These impious, troublesome Fellows, proceed in their Argument thus: If the Author of the Epistle had therefore cited this Testimony of the Psalmist to prove that the World was made by the Son of God, he had miss'd his End; for that was to shew that Excellency of the Son only which he had, being now placed at the *Right Hand of God*; a Purpose which could no way be serv'd, by applying to him the Creation of the World. But on the other hand, forasmuch as the Author cites this place of the Creation, and expressly applies it to the Son of God, we are assur'd that it was not his Design only to shew that Excellency of the Son, which he at length arriv'd at, af-

(*a*) 1 Cor. x. ver. 9. *See the Defence of the* N. C. Sect. 1. chap. 1. *almost entirely concerning this matter, but especially* sect. 12, 14, 15, 16.

ter

ter his Exaltation at the Right Hand of God the Father. Beſides, in the very beginning of the Chapter, the Author had briefly ſaid theſe three Things of our Saviour; That he is the Son of God, by way of Diſtinction; that the Ages, or Worlds, were made by him; and, laſtly, that he was made and declared Heir of all, when in his Fleſh he was taken up into the higheſt Heavens, and there placed at the Right Hand of God the Father. For theſe ſeveral Reaſons, the Author afterwards ſhews from Citations of Scripture, that he was not only far more excellent than the Prophets of God (as has been noted before) but alſo than the Angels themſelves. Now this Teſtimony, of which we are treating, manifeſtly belongs to the ſecond. For which Reaſon the Word tranſlated [*being made*] ought to be render'd [*who is*;] or, according to *Chryſoſtom* and *Theophylact*, expounded [*being exhibited and declared.*] Laſtly, the Sophiſters urge: If the Author of the Epiſtle had really believ'd, and been fully perſuaded that all the Creatures were made by the Son of God, why ſhould he ſo elaborately have made the Compariſon between him and the Angels? Who could doubt whether the Creator was more excellent than the Creatures? I agree with them, that *no one could.* But at that Time, when this Epiſtle was written, there were many, namely, the *Cerinthians* and others, who attributed the Creation of this viſible World at leaſt to the Angels, in the mean time believing our Lord only a mere Creature, a Man, and no more, not exiſting before *Mary*, and conſequently much inferior to the Angels. Further, the carnal *Jews*, who had not yet received the Doctrine of the Goſpel, the Brethren of thoſe to whom this Epiſtle is wrote, believed that the Chriſt, or Meſſiah promiſed by the Prophets, was to be nothing but a Man; and many of their Doctors thought that the Angels were Fellow-Workers with him in the Creation of the Lower World; and

and that it was ſaid to them by God, (*a*) *Let us make Man.* Againſt thoſe the Divine Author ſets himſelf to good purpoſe, when he explains the Excellency of Chriſt the Son of God above Angels; and he very appoſitely inſtructs us againſt them, when he ſays, that the Creation is certainly the Work of the ſupreme God by his Son, who himſelf is alſo God; and that this Work is not compatible with Angels at all, who are themſelves Creatures, and (*b*) *miniſtring Spirits to God.*

I return at laſt to the Words of the Author: *God in theſe laſt Days hath ſpoken to us by his Son, whom he hath made Heir of all things, by whom alſo he made the Worlds.* It is indeed very clear, that the ſacred Writer here intended to ſhew the Congruity of the Divine Diſpenſation, by which it was ſo manag'd, that the World ſhould, in the Fulneſs of Time, be renewed by the ſame Son by which it was made in the Beginning; that he who was Lord in the old Creation, ſhould be Heir and Lord in the new. Thus alſo St. *Paul* argues, (*c*) where he celebrates the ſame Son of God whom he had proclaim'd *the Firſt-begotten of every Creature, i. e.* begotten of God before every Creature, and Maker of all things (for he who denies that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of a Creation, properly ſo called, may, with the ſame Aſſurance, deny that ſuch a Creation is any where deſcribed in Scripture; and conſequently contend that the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis* is to be expounded allegorically) *as the Head of the Body, the Church, and the Firſt-begotten from the Dead.* Immediately after (*d*) he adds this Reaſon, *That he might have the Pre-eminence in all things, i. e.* that every way he might be above all, in reſpect of Reſtoration as well as Inſtitution, as the Beginning of the World, and Head of the Church. Thus, after examining all *Epiſcopius*'s four Manners, in which our Saviour, as

(*a*) *See* Paul Fagius *upon the Place*; Philo Judæus de opificio 6 dierum; *and* Juſtin's *Dialogue with* Trypho, p. 285.
(*b*) Ver. 14. (*c*) Coloſſ. chap. i. ver. 16, 17. (*d*) Ver. 18.

Man, is, by way of Eminence, called the Son of God in Scripture; we have proved that he can't, by any of them, be called the Only, or Only-begotten Son: nay, over and above, we have ſhew'd, that in the Places of Scripture in which theſe Modes or Manners ſeem'd to be contain'd, another, and a far more excellent Filiation of our Saviour is intended, namely, that in which he was with God, as the Only Son of God, before he was made Man, yea, before the Creation.

9. I proceed to the third Argument, taken from the Order and Context of the Creed itſelf. Now it is manifeſt, that *Epiſcopius*'s four Modes are all expreſs'd elſewhere in the Creed, therefore not denoted in thoſe Words [*his Only-begotten Son,*] unleſs we admit a Tautology in ſo ſhort a Form. The ſecond Mode, concerning the Miſſion, or Unction of our Saviour to his Office, is ſignify'd juſt before, in the Word [*Chriſt.*] The other Three, his Conception by the Holy Spirit, his Reſurrection from the Dead, and his Exaltation at the Right Hand of God the Father, are all afterwards expreſs'd in diſtinct Articles. Wherefore, when in the Creed we confeſs Jeſus Chriſt the Only-begotten Son of God, we plainly ſignify that he hath another Filiation, namely, a divine one, different from all the other.

The Author of the *Irenicum* eagerly (as his Cuſtom is) contends, that the Words of the Creed, which follow theſe [*and in Jeſus Chriſt his Only-begotten Son,*] are only added for Deſcription-ſake, *That it might appear what a Son of God is here underſtood, namely, ſuch an one as was born of the Virgin* Mary, *crucify'd, dead, raiſed again, taken up into Heaven, and ſits at the Right Hand of the Father, and ſhall come to judge the Quick and the Dead; all which things denote a ſingular, an only-begotten, and a proper Son of God.* But here the Heretick is as much miſtaken as can be. For, (1.) No ſober Man will believe, that in ſo ſhort a Creed, all thoſe things which are added concerning him, after he is confeſs'd

confeſs'd to be the Only-begotten Son of God, are only added by way of Explication, that it might appear what a Son of God he is; for they make at leaſt half the Creed. (2.) Moſt of thoſe things that follow, make nothing any way to the purpoſe of our Lord's Filiation; namely, *He ſuffer'd under* Pontius Pilate, *was crucify'd, dead, and buried, he deſcended into Hell.* Therefore, (3.) We muſt conclude, that thoſe things that follow the Profeſſion of Faith in the Only-begotten Son of God, are not only added, that it might be the more clearly underſtood who this Son of God was, in whom we muſt believe; but alſo that it might appear what this Son of God did and ſuffer'd for us, what he undertook, and diſcharg'd for our Salvation; namely, that he was conceiv'd by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin *Mary*, was even made Man, and ſuffer'd under *Pontius Pilate.* This (*a*) *Ruffinus* tells us, who well knew the ſenſe of the *Roman* Church, which uſed this Creed: *After that the deſigned Order of the Creed hath been laid before us, the ineffable Myſtery of the Son's Nativity from the Father, it now deſcends to his vouchſafing to engage in the Buſineſs of Man's Salvation, and ſays that he, whom it had before called the Only Son of God, and our Lord, was born of the Virgin* Mary, *by the Holy Ghoſt. This Nativity relates to the Diſpenſation among Men, that* [Sonſhip and Dominion] *to his Divine Subſtance. This belongs to his Condeſcenſion, that to his Nature.* In order to underſtand this Expoſition of *Ruffinus* the better, we are to conſider that the antient Doctors of the Church divided all their Diſcourſes upon Chriſt into theſe two Parts, *The Theology and the Oeconomy.* They call'd that the *Theology*, which belong'd to the Divinity of our Saviour, That he was the Son of God, begotten of God the Father before all Ages, and even God, and that by him all things were made. They called that the *Oeconomy*, or Diſpenſation, which belong'd to his Incarnation, and what he did upon

(*a*) Expoſitio Symboli.

Earth in the Flesh, to procure the Salvation of Mankind. Therefore in the Creed, call'd the *Apostles*, those Words in which we profess our Faith in the Only-begotten Son of God, relate to the Theology; but those that follow, concerning his Conception by the Holy Spirit, his Nativity of the Virgin, and his Passion, to the Dispensation, or Oeconomy (*a*). Thus the Bishops and Doctors of the Catholick Church, from the Apostles, understood and expounded the Rule of Faith concerning our Lord Christ. So (*b*) *Ignatius*, in his genuine Epistle to the *Ephesians: Our God Jesus Christ was conceived by* Mary, *according to the Dispensation of God, of the Seed of* David, *and the Holy Spirit. He was born and baptiz'd.* Therefore the Conception of the Virgin *Mary*, the Nativity, *&c.* according to *Ignatius*, doth not belong to the Description of the Son of God, but to that Dispensation which the Son of God, himself also God, undertook for our Salvation. Thus *Austin*, in the place often cited upon another occasion, says, This is the Faith requisite to the Salvation of all that live under the Gospel, by which they acknowledge *Christ the Son of God, who was even before* Lucifer *and the Moon, and who being incarnate, condescended to be born of the Virgin, that by this Dispensation, the Serpent, an Evil-doer from the Beginning, and the Angels like him, might be destroy'd*, &c. Here the Nativity is expresly refer'd to the Dispensation, which the Son of God, who was before Ages, underwent for our sakes. *Irenæus* also giving us the Rule of Faith receiv'd in all the Churches, (which we have, for the most part, recited before) after the Profession of Faith in the Only-begotten Son of God, that is, after the Theology, presently adds, that the Holy Spirit had foretold by the Prophets, *the Dispensations and Advents, the Nativity of the Virgin, the Passion, Resurrection from the Dead, and the incarnate As-*

(*a*) *Compare* Gal. iv. 4. *with* Eph. i. 10.
(*b*) A. P. Tom. 2. p. 16.

sumption

ſumption into Heaven of our beloved Lord Chriſt Jeſus. Here he expreſly refers the Articles of the Creed, concerning the coming of our Saviour into this World, *i. e.* concerning his Nativity of the Virgin, his Paſſion, and what he did upon Earth, till his Aſcent into Heaven, to thoſe Diſpenſations which he, the Only-begotten Son of God, underwent for our Salvation. The ſame Perſon, (*a*) elegantly deſcribes the Faith of a ſpiritual Man, a true Chriſtian Catholick, concerning the Holy Trinity, in theſe Words: *He hath all things; he has an entire Faith in the One Almighty God, from whom are all things; a firm Perſuaſion in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God, by whom are all things; and in his Diſpenſations, by which the Son of God was made Man; and a true Knowledge of the Holy Spirit of God, who through every Age repreſents to Men, according to the Will of the Father, the Diſpenſations of the Father and the Son.* Here again the holy Man ſhews, that there is a two-fold Knowledge of Chriſtians concerning Chriſt contain'd in the Church's Rule of Faith; one which reſpects his Divine Perſon, that he is the Son of God, by whom all things were made; another which reſpects the Diſpenſations, that he the Son of God was made Man, *&c.* It will not be difficult then to judge, whether Expoſition of the Creed is to be prefer'd, that of theſe Apoſtolical Men and Martyrs, (to whom all the following Catholick Fathers agree) or that of the Author of the *Irenicum*, a modern Opiniator.

10. Our fourth and laſt Argument is deduced from the Senſe and Interpretation of the primitive Catholick Church. In the three firſt Ages, (for there is no Controverſy about the following Ages) the Title of the *Only-begotten*, or *Only Son of God*, given to Chriſt, is plainly determin'd by the conſtant and perpetual uſe of all Catholick Doctors, to mean his Divine Generation from God the Father, before all Ages. All

(*a*) Lib. 4. chap. 62. p. 399.

of them agree to that of *Tertullian* (*a*), concerning the Son of God: *He is the First-begotten, as being begotten before all things; and the Only-begotten, as being alone begotten of God, properly, out of the Womb of his Heart.* For they all of them owned no other Son of God than he, who was begotten of the very Essence of God the Father; that is, who was the *Logos* and Word from his eternal Mind, as we have elsewhere abundantly proved (*b*). Now this is so sure and manifest, that (*c*) *Petavius* himself, otherwise a rigid Censor of them, is forced to confess concerning those *Ante-Nicene* Writers, who seem to have denied the Eternity of the Only-begotten Son of God, (for they only seem to deny it) that they asserted the Son to be *of the Substance or Nature of the Father.* What would we have, then? Hath not the *Roman* Church plainly enough expressed that peculiar manner of Jesus Christ's Filiation, concerning which *Episcopius* speaks in this Creed? Hath she not used the very Words by which all Persons confess this manner of Filiation was denoted in that Age and Church? What though some modern Heretick can coin a new Exposition? Surely, the Creeds of the Churches are to be expounded from the Sense of the Churches, and not the wild Imagination of Hereticks. If this were once admitted, there would soon be an end of every Article of our Faith. He does not hold the Creed of any Church, who does not understand it in the sense of the Church. The Author of a Piece ascrib'd to *Justin*, has spoke excellently upon this Head: (*d*) *It is not the bare giving Glory to the Father and the Son, that is to us the Means of Salvation; but a sound Confession of the Trinity conveys to us the Enjoyment of those good things laid up for the Pious. For one may hear Heterodox Men praising the Father and the Son, but not worshipping them in the true Sense.* In like manner (*e*) St. *Cyprian*, upon those Words of

(*a*) Pag. 503. (*b*) *Defence of the* Nicene Faith, Sect. 2. *throughout.* (*c*) De Trinitate, Lib. 1. chap. 5. sect. 7. (*d*) P. 372. (*e*) P. 200.

Christ,

Chriſt, *Go ye and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: He ſuggeſts the Trinity, into which Myſtery the* Gentiles *are baptiz'd. But does* Marcion *hold this Trinity? Does he aſſert the ſame Creator, God the Father, as we do? One and the ſame Son Chriſt, who was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and made Fleſh,* &c. *No,* Marcion, *and the other Hereticks, have a Faith widely different from ours, nay rather, they have nothing among them, but Perfidy, Blaſphemy, and Contention, the Enemies of Truth and Holineſs.*

Thus let us alſo refute *Epiſcopius* and others, who would perſuade us that the *Arians* and *Socinians* are to be eſteem'd our Brethren, becauſe, forſooth, they receive the common Creed of the Church, and profeſs Faith in Chriſt, the Only-begotten Son of God, as well as we. But do they believe in the ſame Only-begotten Son of God, in which we Catholicks at this day, and all the Catholick Church always believ'd? No, their Faith is widely different, or rather, they have none. The Church believes, and always did believe in the Only-begotten Son of God, who was begotten of God the Father before all Ages, and was himſelf God; ſuch a Son of God as neither of thoſe Hereſies ſincerely confeſs. For the *Arians* (if you ſtrip their Notion of its Vizard) have a Son of God Only-begotten too, who is indeed a Creature made of nothing, though more excellent than all the reſt, and produced before them. The *Socinians* Only-begotten Son is a mere Man, not exiſting before his Nativity of the Virgin. Both of them in Word profeſs the Faith of the Church concerning the Only-begotten Son of God; but their inward Notion and Sentiment is clean Hereſy and Blaſphemy. Further, from what we have diſcourſed ſo largely concerning the Creed called the *Apoſtles*, you may ſee the Vanity, the Folly, and, if you pleaſe, the matchleſs Impudence of the (*a*) *Racovian Catechiſt*, who boaſts, *That he and his*

(*a*) Catech. Racov. 1609. p. 39.

Friends only believe concerning the Person of Christ, that he is by Nature truly Man, as the Creed, commonly called the Apostles, *and embrac'd by all Christians in common with them, testifies.*

CHAP. VI.

Of the Antient Eastern *Creed.*

1. I Come now to the fourth and last Position; namely,

That special Mode of Jesus Christ's Filiation, in which he existed in his better Nature before all Ages, being begotten of God the Father, and therefore God, is expresly taught and declar'd in the Creed, or Rule of Faith, which obtain'd in the most antient Eastern *Churches before the Council of* Nice.

2. It is not to be doubted but that the *Eastern* Churches had their Creed, or rather Creeds, before the Council of *Nice*; Creeds, I mean, more large and explicit than that first and most antient Creed *Episcopius* mentions, conceiv'd in these Words only, *I believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.* It is very plain that the *Roman*, and the other *Western* Churches, had their Creed before the Council of *Nice*, larger than that simple Confession of the Trinity, from *Ruffinus* and *Austin*; nay, from *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and the Writers of the third Century. As for the *Roman* Church, which the other *Western* Churches generally follow'd, *Vossius* (*a*) hath given us the expres Words of *Vigilius*, where he writes thus: *All profess to believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his Son, our Lord. To this Head he* [Eutyches] *calum-*

(*a*) Vossius de tribus Symbolis.

niously

niously objects this: Why do they not say, And in one Jesus Christ his Son, *according to the Decree of the Council of* Nice? *But at* Rome, *even before that Synod met, even from the Times of the Apostles till now, and under* Cœlestine, *of blessed Memory, who he owns to be Orthodox, the Creed was the same; nor are the Words any way prejudicial, where the Sense is sound.*

Now if the *Roman* and *Western* Churches had such a Creed before the Council of *Nice*, why not the *Eastern* also? Nay, such a Creed was more necessary for these Churches than for the *Roman*, as I have (*a*) before observ'd from *Ruffinus*, because they were grievously disturb'd in the first Ages by Hereticks, who gave the *Roman* Church no Trouble. Besides, the *Greek Ante-Nicene* Writers frequently mention the Rule of Faith in their Writings; and *Irenæus*, an *Asiatick*, and doubtless one of them, gives us this Rule at large. So *Eusebius*, in the Synod of *Nice*, recited a larger Confession of Faith, which the Catechumen was taught, and profess'd in the Baptistery, before the Fathers had made their Creed (*b*).

3. Further, we must needs conclude, that the Churches of the *East* did not reject their antient Creed, after that of the Council was set forth. For we see that the *Roman* Church retain'd her old Creed after the Council. And who can doubt but that the Churches of the *East* did so likewise? For the Decrees of the *Nicene* Council being Oecumenical, did equally respect all the Churches of Christ; so that the case in this matter was the same as to *Eastern* and *Western*. Now the *Nicene* Fathers, I suppose, never had any Design either to make a new Creed, or to deliver down the old *Eastern* Creed entire, with their own Addition; but only to assert the true and receiv'd Sense of that Article of the old Creed relating to the Son of God, against the *Arians*. They indeed premise the Article of the old Creed, concerning God the Father (though

(*a*) *See above.* (*b*) Socrates, Lib. 1. chap. 8. p. 20, & 21.

not

not entire) to their Confeſſion concerning the Son of God, and they ſubjoin to it ſomething concerning the Faith in the Holy Spirit. But this they did, as thinking the Faith concerning the Son of God could not be explain'd juſtly, without a Profeſſion of the Father and Holy Spirit. Hereupon, as ſoon as they have barely mention'd the Holy Spirit, they immediately return to the Article concerning the Son, their main Buſineſs, and denounce an Anathema againſt thoſe who denied his true and eternal Divinity. Now I will prove hereafter, and that indiſputably, that many things were left out in the *Nicene Creed* after thoſe Words [*and in the Holy Ghoſt*] which were extant in the Creed receiv'd by the firſt *Eaſtern* Churches. This however is certain, that the *Nicene* Biſhops never intended that their Creed ſhould from that time be uſed in adminiſtring Baptiſm, (the Anathematiſm which concludes it, is repugnant to that end) but left every Church to uſe their former Creeds. Sure, if the Holy Synod had intended that, either the *Roman* and *Weſtern* Churches, whoſe Biſhops made a great part of the Synod, did not underſtand her Meaning, or deſpiſed it; which no ſober Man can imagine. For *Ruffinus*, in his Preface to the Expoſition of the *Aquileian* Creed, expreſly teſtifies, *That at* Rome *they kept up the old Cuſtom, that they who were to receive the Grace of Baptiſm, ſhould repeat the Creed in the Audience of the People*; the old *Roman* Creed, of which he had been ſpeaking before. And a little after he ſays, that he took upon him the old Creed of *Aquileia* (in ſome things different from the *Roman*) in the Grace of Baptiſm; that is, profeſs'd that Creed when he was baptiz'd.

4. Theſe things premis'd, I proceed to prove my Poſition. The Churches of *Paleſtine* were the moſt antient of all other, and of them the Church of *Jeruſalem*, as being that from which the Doctrine of the Goſpel firſt came, and was derived to the other parts of the World. Hence the *Conſtantinopolitan* Fathers called

called it *the Mother of all Churches* (*a*). Though this firſt Church, almoſt from the Inſtitution of Metropolitans till the Council of *Chalcedon*, was ſubjected to *Cæſarea*; yet, for the Reaſon above-mention'd, all other Churches held it in great Eſteem. Now what the antient Creed of *Jeruſalem* was, and what it taught to believe concerning the Perſon of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *Cyril*, made Biſhop of that Church in 350, will beſt inform us. He, while yet a Catechiſt, explain'd this Creed by parts to the *Competentes*; all which parts, joined together, make this Confeſſion: *I believe in One God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things viſible and inviſible*; *and in One Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all Worlds, true God, by whom all things were made, incarnate and made Man, crucify'd and buried*; *who roſe again from the Dead the third Day, and aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth at the Right Hand of the Father, and who cometh to judge the Quick and the Dead, whoſe Kingdom ſhall have no End: And in the Holy Spirit the Comforter, who hath ſpoken by the Prophets*; *the one Baptiſm of Repentance, for the Remiſſion of Sins*; *and in the one Catholick Church*; *the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, and the Life Everlaſting.*

5. It is plain, this is not the *Nicene Creed*, and that it hath not the Additions of the *Conſtantinopolitan* concerning the Holy Ghoſt. The latter no one can wonder at, who remembers that *Cyril*'s Catechiſms, in which this Creed is recited, were wrote many Years before the Council of *Conſtantinople*, *i. e.* before the Year 381. It remains then, that this muſt be the old Creed of the Church of *Jeruſalem*. This is alſo clear, becauſe *Cyril* expounds it to the Candidates for Baptiſm: now in the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, both the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches held their old Creeds, as I have ſhewn before, after the *Nicene* Council. In this Creed, every one may ſee the Divine Generation

(*a*) Theodor. E. H. Lib. 5. cap. 9. p. 211.

of

of the Son from God the Father, declar'd in the plaineſt Terms, namely, in theſe: *The Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all Ages, true God, by whom all things were made.* Nor do I doubt but that *Euſebius*, a *Paleſtine* born, and afterwards Biſhop of *Cæſarea*, had an eye to this Creed; when, in the Council of *Nicé*, giving an Account of the Confeſſion he receiv'd in his Catechiſation and Baptiſm, he thus delivers the Article concerning the Son of God: (*a*) *And in One Lord Jeſus Chriſt, God of God, the Only-begotten Son, begotten of God the Father before all Ages, by whom all things were made.* Here we have the very Words of the Creed of *Jeruſalem*, except that for [*True God*] *Euſebius* ſubſtitutes [*God of God*]: where he cautiouſly, as almoſt every where elſe, thought proper to guard againſt the *Sabellians*, by ſo aſſerting the true Divinity of the Son, as ſtill to preſerve the Father's Prerogative, who is God of himſelf, and the Diſtinction between Father and Son, founded in that Prerogative. To this alſo the *Nicene* Fathers conſented, and ſo put the Words [*God of God*] in their Confeſſion concerning the Son of God; yet adding, according to the old Creed, [*true God of true God*] and more fully explaining it, when they immediately call the Son of God conſubſtantial with the Father; *i. e.* not of any created or changeable Nature, but altogether of the ſame truly divine and immutable Nature with God the Father: which alſo was always *Euſebius*'s Opinion (*b*).

6. There are indeed ſome learned Men, who contend that thoſe Catechiſms are not *Cyril*'s, but one *John*'s, his Predeceſſor, or Succeſſor in the See of *Jeruſalem*. If this was true, we have nothing to fear from it; for whether *Cyril* or *John* wrote them, it is certain the Creed in them is that uſually explain'd to the *Competentes* in the Church of *Jeruſalem*,

(*a*) Socrates, Lib. 1. chap. 8. p. 21.
(*b*) *See the Defence of the* Nicene Creed, Sect. 4. chap. 1.

and

and therefore antiently received in it. But (*a*) *Voſſius* has clearly proved the Catechiſms to be *Cyril*'s, againſt theſe ſuperfine Criticks. (*b*) *Jerome*, *Cyril*'s Contemporary, expreſly ſays they are his, and that they were wrote in his Youth. And *Theodoret*, to name no more, cites them as *Cyril*'s. But yet the ſame *Voſſius* ſays in the ſame place, *That there is ſomething which may occaſion a Scruple, not touch'd upon by any, namely, that in this Creed there are ſome things which ſeem to be taken from the* Conſtantinopolitan, *i. e. what is added after the Words* [the Holy Spirit] *the Paraclete, who ſpake by the Prophets, and in the one Baptiſm of Repentance*, &c. The learned Man thought that thoſe things were not in the *Eaſtern* Creed before the Council of *Conſtantinople*; induced, as he himſelf tells us, by the Concluſion of the *Nicene Creed*, in theſe Words [*and in the Holy Spirit.*] But there is nothing in this (though the great *Eraſmus* has alſo urg'd it) as hath already appear'd from the beginning of this Chapter, and as I ſhall make more plain by what I have to ſay hereafter. As for the Additions in the Creed of *Jeruſalem*, after the Words [*in the holy Spirit*] I will clearly prove that they were not taken from the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed, but were in the moſt antient *Eaſtern* Creeds long before the Council of *Conſtantinople*, or even that of *Nice*.

7. (1.) It is certain that the Creeds which the *Weſtern* Churches uſed before the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and even that of *Nice*, did not end in thoſe Words [*and in the Holy Spirit*] but had after them other Articles of Faith. Now who can conſider what we have before obſerv'd concerning the Original of almoſt all Hereſy in the *Eaſt*, and yet eaſily believe that the *Weſtern* Creeds were larger than theirs. Now it is readily proved that there were ſome Heads of Chriſtian Doctrine in the antient Creeds of the *Weſt*, ſubjoined to the Article concerning the Holy Spirit. For

(*a*) De tribus Symbolis, *Diſſ.* 1. *Theſ.* 51. (*b*) Catalogus Scriptor. Eccleſ.

Cyprian

(*a*) *Cyprian*, ſpeaking to *Magnus* of the Creed the *Novatians*, as well as the Catholicks, uſed in Baptiſm, ſays; *When they ſay, Doſt thou believe the Remiſſion of Sins, and Life Everlaſting by the Holy Church? They ask a falſe Queſtion, becauſe they have no Church.* Here you have three Articles, of the Church, the Remiſſion of Sins, and Everlaſting Life, expreſs'd in the old *African* Creed. Further, (*b*) *Tertullian* expreſly makes the Article concerning the Church a neceſſary Part of the Confeſſion to be made by one who is to be baptiz'd. *Now when the Evidence of our Faith, and the Security or Aſſurance of our Salvation is pledg'd to us before three* [*divine Perſons, namely, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*] *the mention of the Church is neceſſary to be added.* To the ſame purpoſe is what (*c*) *Tertullian* ſays of Chriſt not baptizing in his own Perſon: *Into what ſhould he baptize them? Into Repentance? To what purpoſe then was his Fore-runner? Into Remiſſion of Sins? He gave that with a Word. Into himſelf, whom he veil'd with Humility? Into the Holy Spirit, who was not yet deſcended from the Father? Into the Church, whom the Apoſtles had not yet built?* Here we have the Article of the *Remiſſion of Sins* hinted, *&c.* This I mention in particular, upon *Eraſmus*'s account, who ſays that Article was added againſt *Novatus*. But *Novatus* had not yet appear'd in the World in *Tertullian*'s time; for he was *Novatian*'s Contemporary, aſſiſted him in promoting his Schiſm, and therefore diſturbed the Church in St. *Cyprian*'s days; whence it came to paſs that ſome, eſpecially the *Greeks*, confounded *Novatus* and *Novatian*, as the ſame Hereſiarch; contrary to which (*d*) St. *Cyprian* writes, *You have behav'd with Diligence and Affection, deareſt Brother, in ſending* Nicephorus *the Acolyth to us ſpeedily, to tell the glorious and agreeable News to us and the Confeſſors which are return'd, and to inſtruct us fully againſt the pernicious and novel Attempts of* Novatus *and* Novatian *to oppoſe*

(*a*) P. 183. Ep. ad Magnum. (*b*) P. 226. (*c*) P. 228.
(*d*) P. 95. Ep. ad Cornelium 52.

the

the Church of Christ. Besides, the *Novatians* baptiz'd into the same Rule of Faith with the Catholicks; and more, requir'd of their Followers the Profession of the Article concerning the Remission of Sins, as is plain also from (*a*) St. *Cyprian.* For *Novatus*, or *Novatian*, did not simply deny the Remission of Sins, but both of them, that that Remission did not belong to certain heinous Sins (such as they were polluted with, who sacrific'd to Idols, or pretended to have done it) committed after Baptism; or at least were not to be remitted according to the course of Church-Discipline (*b*). But this by way of Digression.

8. (2.) In the (*c*) *Apostolical Constitutions*, we have a Confession of Faith, or a Creed to be recited by Persons to be baptiz'd; in which, after the Profession of Faith *in God the Father unbegotten, and in his Only-begotten Son, begotten before Ages, begotten, not made*; it follows, *I am also baptiz'd into the Holy Spirit, that is, the Comforter, who hath operated in all Saints from the Beginning, and who was lately sent to the Apostles by the Father, according to the Promise of our Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ; and after the Apostles, to all that believe in the Holy Catholick Church, the Resurrection of the Flesh, the Remission of Sins, the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Life of the World to come.* Here we have almost all those Words, which in the *Jerusalem* Creed follow that Article, [*And in the Holy Ghost*] with this difference, that the Author expounds the Words [*who spake by the Prophets*] thus, [*who operated in all Saints from the Beginning*] and transposes the other Articles. Those Words only [*And in one Baptism of Repentance*] are wanting, of which hereafter. Now that very excellent Person (*d*) Cardinal *Bona*, and other learned Men, give this consentient Opinion of the Constitutions: *Whatsoever may be said of the Author of these Constitutions, all agree that it is certain and evident they were more antient than the Council of*

(*a*) *See above.* (*b*) Socrates, E. H. Lib. 1. cap. 10.
(*c*) Tom. 1. P. A. Lib. 7. cap. 41. p. 380.
(*d*) Rerum Liturg. Lib. 1. cap. 8. Sect. 4.

Nice;

Nice; *and that in them is contain'd the Discipline of the Christian Church before* Constantine *the Great, as the learned (a)* Morinus *tells us; to whom (b)* Joannes Fronto *assents in his Observations before the* Roman *Calendar.* Now as to the Creed in those Constitutions, the Author (or rather Interpolater) of the Book gives us an entire Paraphrase of it, according to Custom; but yet it is clear, that the Creed in his Eye was neither the *Nicene* nor the *Constantinopolitan*, (it has not the Additions of the one against *Arius*, nor of the other against *Macedonius*) but manifestly agrees with the Creed of *Jerusalem.*

9. (3.) The third Argument may be taken from the Confession of Faith which *Arius* and *Euzoius* offer'd to *Constantine* in their own Names, and those of their Accomplices; and by which they intended to persuade the Emperor, that in all things they believ'd as *the whole Catholick Church and the Scriptures teach (c).* Now in that Confession, after the Article concerning the Holy Spirit, are these words: *And in the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the Life of the World to come, and the Kingdom of Heaven, and the one Catholick Church of God.* Here you have three of the four Articles in the *Jerusalem* Creed placed after the Article concerning the Holy Spirit, though not in the same Order. But since this Confession of Faith was written many Years before the Synod of *Constantinople*, it is impossible that the Hereticks should have follow'd that Precedent in the Recital of those Articles. It remains then, that they had an Eye to the old *Eastern* Creed, in which those Articles are. In the like manner, in the Creed of the *Eastern* Bishops at *Sardica* (an *Arian* Council) as we have it in the Fragments of *Hilary*, after the Profession of Faith in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, *&c.* are these Words; *We believe in the Holy Church, the Remission of Sins, the*

(*a*) De sacris Ordin. pars 2. p. 20. (*b*) In Prænotatis ad Calendar. Rom. sect. 5. (*c*) Socrates, Lib. 1. cap. 26. p. 51.

Resur-

Reſurrection of the Fleſh, and eternal Life. Here you have the Article of Remiſſion of Sins, which was omitted in the former Confeſſion.

10. (4.) To theſe clear Arguments, I have yet one evident Reaſon to add. Thoſe Words in the *Jeruſalem* Creed which follow [*and in the Holy Spirit*] manifeſtly concern certain Hereſies which diſturb'd the Church of Chriſt, eſpecially the *Eaſtern*, moſt in the ſecond Century, and which were ſilenc'd long before the Council of *Conſtantinople*: It is therefore abſurd to determine that thoſe Additions were then made to the *Eaſtern Creed*; I mean, the Hereſies of *Simon*, *Menander*, *Cerinthus*, and others, comprehended under the general Name of *Gnoſticks*, which (*a*) *Gregory Nazianzen*, who flouriſh'd at the time of the Council of *Conſtantinople*, and before it, ſays, had in his days a long time diſappear'd. It remains, then, that I prove thoſe Articles which follow that of the Holy Spirit in the Creed of *Jeruſalem*, to be levell'd againſt the Dotage, or rather the monſtrous Opinions of the *Gnoſticks*. If in the explaining this matter, I ſhall be longer than ordinary, I ſuppoſe it will neither be ungrateful or unprofitable to a Lover of Antiquity.

11. I ſhall begin with the Words immediately following, [*the Comforter, who ſpake by the Prophets.*] The Word here render'd *Comforter*, is in the Scripture a known Appellation of the Holy Spirit, and of an extenſive Signification; for it denotes a Teacher, a Comforter, and an Advocate. Now this Epithet of the Holy Ghoſt is not in the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed, the Reaſon of which Omiſſion I ſhall explain a little hereafter: but it is (as I have ſhewn above) in the *Clementine* Creed, and in the Creed of the *Arians* at *Sardica*. It is very probable, that Word was added againſt the *Gnoſticks*; for moſt of thoſe Hereticks taught that the Paraclete and Holy Spirit were two different *Æons* (*b*). But not to inſiſt upon this, the

(*a*) Orat. 23. (*b*) Vide Tertullian contra Valentin. p. 253, & 255.

following Words [*who spake by the Prophets*] are plainly directed against the Heresy of the *Gnosticks*. For almost all of them taught, that there was one God, the Maker of this visible World, preach'd by the Law and the Prophets, and another who is manifested in the Gospel; and that the old Prophets were not inspir'd by the Holy Spirit, but by a certain Power proceeding from that God of the World, (which some of them were not afraid to call Evil) therefore their Writings were not to be regarded, nay, to be utterly rejected. *Ignatius*, no doubt, had an eye to this Heresy, when he thus admonishes the *Philadelphians*: (*a*) *Let us love the Prophets, because they also preach'd the Gospel.* His Interpolater has rightly understood his Meaning: (*b*) *The Prophets and Apostles received from God by Jesus Christ the same Holy Spirit, the good, the great, the true, the communicative, the right Spirit. For there is one God of the Old and New Testament. There is one Mediator of God and Men, for the Creation of spiritual and sensible Things, and a proper and regular Providence over them: And there is one Paraclete, who operated in* Moses, *the Prophets and Apostles.* And a little after, *If any one confesses the Lord Jesus Christ, but denies the God of the Law and the Prophets, affirming that the Father of Christ is not the Maker of Heaven and Earth, such an one is not in the Truth, even as the Devil is not; and such an one is a Disciple of* Simon Magus, *but not of the Holy Spirit.* Many such like Passages you may find in *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and other Antients.

12. I am wholly of opinion, that those Words [*who spake by the Prophets*] or those equivalent to them, were placed in the most antient *Eastern* Creeds, against this Blasphemy of the *Gnosticks*. For *Irenæus* giving us the Rule of Faith which obtain'd in his time, hath these Words upon the Article concerning the Holy Spirit, [*who preach'd the Dispensations of God by the Prophets.*] In like manner, in the Compendium of the old

(*a*) Tom. 2. P. A. p. 32. (*b*) P. 82.

Creed,

Creed, cited in *Greek* by *Damascene*, and by us transcribed entire above, the Faith in the Holy Spirit is thus expounded: *And a true Knowledge of the Holy Spirit, which represents to Men in every Age the Dispensations of God, as the Father pleases.* Thus *Athenagoras*, something antienter than *Irenæus*, giving us the Confession of all Christians concerning the Trinity in Unity, thus represents the Catholick Faith concerning the Holy Spirit: (*a*) *And we say that the Holy Ghost, which worked in the Prophets, was an Efflux of God.* In the same place, a little before he had said, *The prophetical Spirit also says as we do.* Before these, (*b*) *Justin* also expounding the Christian Faith concerning the most glorious Trinity, describes the third Person after the same manner: *We also worship and adore him, and the Son that came from him, and the prophetick Spirit, honouring them in Reason and Truth.* To this we have a (*c*) parallel place: *We with reason honour the prophetick Spirit in the third place.* Again, speaking of the Prophets of the Old Testament, he adds, (*d*) *By whom the prophetick Spirit foretold what was to come before it came.* What follows in the (*e*) same Piece, comes yet nearer to the Words of the *Jerusalem* Creed, where again treating of the Faith and Confession of the Holy Trinity, into which the Christians of his time were baptiz'd, he thus expresses what belongs to the third Person: *And he who is baptiz'd, is also wash'd in the Name of the Holy Spirit, who foretold by the Prophets all the things concerning Jesus.* Sure he must have little Judgment or Candour, who can consider so many and so plain Testimonies, and yet deny that the Words [*who spake by the Prophets*] or Words equivalent to them, were used to describe the Holy Spirit in the most antient *Eastern* Creed. I have indeed often wonder'd that the *Constantinopolitan* Fathers should add [*who spake by the Prophets*] after these Words ap-

(*a*) Pag. 10, & 11. (*b*) P. 56. (*c*) P. 60. (*d*) P. 72. (*e*) P. 94.

Plied to the Holy Spirit [*the Lord, giving Life, proceeding from the Father, who, together with the Father and the Son, is worſhipp'd and glorify'd.*] The Addition ſeem'd low and mean, after thoſe magnificent Expreſſions. But after I underſtood that the old *Eaſtern* Creed had theſe Words [*the Paraclete, who ſpake by the Prophets,*] I came to this Determination, that the Synod, inſtead of [*the Paraclete*] had given us thoſe magnificent Expreſſions, the more clearly to aſſert the true Divinity of the Spirit againſt *Macedonius*; and then added [*who ſpake by the Prophets*] becauſe it was ſo read in the antient Creed: This by the way.

13. I proceed to the following Article, *In one Baptiſm of Repentance, in the Remiſſion of Sins.* Theſe, in *Cyril*'s printed Catechiſms, are two diſtinct Members; but by all means to be joined in one Article, as we have it in the *Conſtantinopolitan* Creed: *I confeſs one Baptiſm for the Remiſſion of Sins*; ſo that Baptiſm is here made the means of obtaining Remiſſion, and Remiſſion the end of Baptiſm. This Article, I am fully perſuaded, is directed againſt the Hereſy of the *Gnoſticks*. For *Irenæus* (*a*) ſays of the *Valentinians*, that by the Deluſions of the Devil they were led into the Denial of Baptiſm, by which we are regenerated to God, and conſequently into the Rejection of all Faith. Now all of them did not defend this Impiety after the ſame manner; for one Sect of them did annul the only Baptiſm of Chriſt, by the Diſtinction of a two-fold Baptiſm; the other took away all Baptiſm which is perform'd by external Rites. Of the former, *Irenæus* writes a little after, in the ſame Chapter, thus: *For the Baptiſm of Jeſus, who appear'd, is that of the Remiſſion of Sins; but the Redemption of Chriſt, who deſcended into him, is to Perfection. The one they ſuppoſe to be animal, the other ſpiritual*; *that Baptiſm was preach'd by* John *to Repentance, but the Redemption was brought by Jeſus to Perfection. And that this is what he ſpeaks of, when he*

(*a*) Pag. 106. Lib. 1. cap. 18.

ſays,

ſays, I have another Baptiſm to be baptiz'd with, to which I preſs forward with all Might. Of theſe, *Irenæus* ſpeaks afterwards, that they celebrated that external Water-Baptiſm in another Form, and by other Rites than thoſe receiv'd in the Catholick Church. Of the later Sect of the *Valentinians*, (*a*) *Irenæus* treats towards the end of the Chapter, cited thus: *But others rejecting all theſe things, ſay, we ought not to perform the Myſtery of the unſpeakable and inviſible Power, by viſible and corruptible Creatures; of inconceivable and incorporeal things, by thoſe which are ſenſible and bodily; and that the perfect Redemption is the very Acknowledgment of the ineffable Majeſty.* Is it not plain, then, that the Article of the *Jeruſalem* Creed, *I believe in one Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of Sins*, is a very proper Antidote againſt theſe impious Tenets of the *Gnoſticks*. For the Catholicks profeſs'd in theſe Words, Firſt, That Baptiſm was neceſſary, both as commanded, and as a mean, at leaſt an ordinary one: Then, that there was only one Baptiſm of Chriſt, namely, that which the Church obſerves. Laſtly, that that one Baptiſm, is the Baptiſm of Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins; and that no Man arrives at that Perfection in this Life, as not to ſtand in need of Remiſſion of Sins. Moreover, I therefore really think, that *Irenæus* had an eye to this Article of the old *Eaſtern* Creed; becauſe, in his Rule of Faith, he obſerves, that we are taught to believe, that eternal Salvation will be given not only to them who have kept the Commandments of our Lord from the Beginning, but alſo to them who have done it by, or after Repentance; univerſal Repentance, a Departure out of a State of Sin and Death, into a State of Righteouſneſs and Salvation.

14. I now come to the Article [*And in one Catholick Church.*] The Word *Catholick*, ſome Perſons think to be lately added, againſt the *Novatians*, and other

(*a*) Pag. 108.

Schismaticks, who, in the third Century, disturb'd the Peace of the Church. Of this Opinion was (*a*) *J. G. Vossius*. However, it is certain, (though the great Man seems not to have observ'd it) that the Church had that Attribute in the very Age after the Apostles. For in the Epistle of the *Smyrnæan* Brethren, concerning the Blessed *Polycarp*'s Martyrdom, we have it mention'd in the Salutation thus: (*b*) *The Church of God which is at* Smyrna, *to the Church at* Philomelium, *and to all the Dioceses of the Holy Catholick Church every where, Mercy, Peace, and the Love of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied.* In the same Epistle, the *Smyrnæans* say, that *Polycarp* being about to die, remember'd in his Prayers, *The whole Catholick Church throughout the World* (*c*). Nay, before *Polycarp*, *Ignatius* expressly gives this Epithet to the Church of God, saying, *Wheresoever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholick Church.* Well, then, said (*d*) Valesius, *This Sirname appears to have been given the Church about the first Succession of the Apostles, when Heresies arose in many places, and attempted to subvert the true Faith of Christ, and the Tradition of the Apostles. For then the Name* Catholick *was given to the Orthodox only, that the true genuine Church of Christ might be distinguish'd from the spurious Conventicles of Hereticks.* Now it is further to be observ'd, that the *Gnosticks*, who chiefly spread their Heresies in the first Succession of the Apostles, were most of them so consummately impudent, as to boast, that the pure and sincere Gospel was only taught in their Conventicles; that they alone had discover'd and knew the Mysteries of God, and the true Way of obtaining Salvation, whence also they assum'd the Name of *Gnosticks*: but that that Doctrine which the Catholick Church had receiv'd from the Apostles, and embraced, was generally false

(*a*) De tribus Symbolis, *Diss.* 1. *Thes.* 39.
(*b*) Euseb. E. H. Lib. 4. cap. 15. p. 104.
(*c*) A. P. Tom. 2. p. 37.
(*d*) *Notes upon* Euseb. Lib. 7.

and

and ſpurious. Thus (*a*) *Irenæus* writes of them: *When they are refuted out of the Scriptures, they arraign them, as not right, nor authoritative, as having various Readings, and not being able to inſtruct thoſe in the Truth, who know not Tradition. For they ſay, that the Truth was not written, but ſpoken; and that* Paul *therefore ſaid,* But we ſpeak Wiſdom among thoſe that are perfect, but not the Wiſdom of this World. *Now every one of them calls his own Fiction Wiſdom; ſo that according to them, forſooth, the Truth is ſometimes in* Valentinus, *ſometimes in* Marcion, *ſometimes in* Cerinthus, *and laſtly, in* Baſilides. *For every one of them being very forward, is not aſham'd to preach up himſelf, corrupting the Rule of Truth.* Again, *When we appeal to Apoſtolical Tradition, preſerved in the Churches through the Succeſſions of Presbyters, they oppoſe Tradition; advance, that they have found out the ſincere Truth, and are wiſer not only than the Preſbyters, but even the Apoſtles; that the Apoſtles mix the things of the Law with the Words of our Saviour; and that not only the Apoſtles, but our Lord himſelf, ſpoke ſometimes from the Creator, ſometimes from a middle Power, and ſometimes from the higheſt; but that they do certainly, purely and ſincerely know the hidden Myſtery, which is the moſt impudent Blaſphemy againſt their Maker.* Againſt theſe impious Opiniators, all the Sons of the Church of that Age were very juſtly engag'd to profeſs their Faith in one Catholick Church, *i. e.* that they would conſtantly adhere to that Doctrine and Faith, which, according to the Holy Scriptures, was preach'd with one Conſent in all the Apoſtolical Churches by the Biſhops and Doctors. The Senſe of the Article can't be better expreſs'd than it is by (*b*) *Irenæus*: *We ought not now to ſeek the Truth of others, which we may eaſily have from the Church, ſince the Apoſtles have very largely caſt into it, as into a rich Treaſury, all Truth; ſo that he who will, may draw from it living Water. This is the way to Life, all the reſt are Thieves and Robbers; wherefore*

(*a*) Lib. 3. cap. 2. p. 230. (*b*) Lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 242.

we ought to avoid them; but, with all diligence, to chuſe what the Church offers, and to lay hold upon the Tradition of Truth.

15. The other two Articles, *of the Reſurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Life*, we have expreſly in the *Clementine* Creed, in the Confeſſion of *Arius* and *Eunoius*, in that alſo of the pretended *Arian* Synod of *Sardica*, and in *Irenæus*'s Rule of Faith. It is too well known, to need any Proof, that moſt of the *Gnoſticks* denied the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, and conſequently the Life Everlaſting. For thus (*a*) *Irenæus* ſpeaks of them: *Surely they are vain Men to contemn the whole Diſpenſation of God, to deny the Salvation of the Fleſh, and to reject its Renovation, ſaying, that it is not capable of Incorruptibility.* The ſame Hereſy he (*b*) charges upon *Baſilides* by name, and (*c*) *Marcion*, in which (*d*) *Tertullian* agrees with him. The ſame impious Tenet (*e*) *Auſtin* imputes to *Simon Magus*, *Carpocrates*, *Valentinus*, *Apelles*, and other Hereticks of the ſame Stamp. Now from what has been ſaid, it follows plainly, that the Words in the *Jeruſalem* Creed, after theſe, [*and in the Holy Spirit*] were not added to the *Eaſtern* Creed by the *Conſtantinopolitan* Fathers, but placed there long before the Synod of *Conſtantinople*, or that of *Nice*, againſt the impious Dotage of the *Gnoſticks*, who began in the beginning of the ſecond Century to ſet their falſe Wares to publick Sale.

16. That you may plainly ſee the Antiquity of this whole *Hieroſolymitan* Creed, I will not think it too much briefly to ſhew, that even the preceding Articles of it, concerning God the Father and the Son, are ſo drawn up, as manifeſtly to ſtrike at the Blaſphemy of the *Gnoſticks*. The Article concerning God the Father, is conceiv'd in theſe Words: *I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth,*

(*a*) Lib. 5. cap. 2. p. 434. (*b*) Lib. 1. cap. 23. p. 119.
(*c*) Cap. 29. p. 129. (*d*) De præſcript. adv. Hæreticos.
(*e*) De Hæreſibus.

and

and of all things visible and invisible. The *Cerinthians*, and the other *Gnosticks*, did not acknowledge God the Father as Creator, asserting, that *Demiurgus*, the Creator, the God of this World, was one, and the Father of our Lord Christ another. The *Cerdonites* and *Marcionites* were not afraid to say, that there were two Gods, two Principles. But all the *Gnosticks* attributed the visible and invisible things to different Creators, and denied that this visible World was made by the supreme God. It follows in the Creed, [*and in one Lord Jesus Christ.*] The *Cerinthians* (as I have shewn in this Piece, and elsewhere) denied that Jesus Christ was one, separating Jesus from Christ; and affirming, that Christ descended from above into Jesus, when he was baptiz'd, and at his Passion flew back again into his *Pleroma.* The same *Cerinthians*, and the *Carpocratians* (with whom the *Ebionites* also agreed in this) taught that our Lord Jesus was a mere Man, the Son of a Man, and that he did not exist before he was born of *Mary.* The following Words glance at them, namely, *the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all Ages, true God.* All the *Gnosticks* denied that God the Father made all things by his Son; it was therefore added, *by whom all things were made.* What follows, namely, *Incarnate, and made Man, crucify'd,* &c. manifestly strike at the *Docetæ*, who affirmed, that our Lord only seemed to be born, to suffer, and to die; which Heresy almost all the *Gnosticks* defended. After the Article concerning Christ's coming to judge the Quick and the Dead, are these Words, *Whose Kingdom shall have no end.* These Words, though not in the *Nicene* Creed, are in the *Constantinopolitan*, notwithstanding that they have no relation to the *Macedonian* Controversy. We have also the same Words in the *Clementine* Creed. Now that they were not added by the *Constantinopolitan* Fathers, but were in the old Creed which obtain'd in the *East* long before the Council of *Constantinople*, or even of *Nice*, is plain from this, that we find Words equivalent to them in most

moſt of the (*a*) *Arian* Confeſſions, in which they endeavour'd to perſuade others, that they had ſtrictly obſerv'd the antient Rule of Catholick Faith. So the (*b*) *Euſebians*, in their Confeſſion, ſay, they believe *that Chriſt will come to judge the Quick and the Dead, and will remain a King and a God for ever.* Thus alſo the Confeſſion of (*c*) *Theophronius* ſpeaks of Chriſt, *That he ſhall come again with Glory and Power to judge the Quick and the Dead, and ſhall remain for ever.* The Confeſſion of the *Arians*, ſent into *France* by *Marcellus*, and others, more fully explains this Clauſe, thus: (*d*) *Whoſe indiſſoluble Kingdom remains for infinite Ages.* Their Confeſſion ſent into *Italy* by *Macedonius*, and others, and the Confeſſion of the Council of *Syrmium*, ſpeak to the ſame purpoſe. It is therefore manifeſt, that Clauſe concerning the Eternity of Chriſt's Kingdom was in the old *Eaſtern* Creed. That moſt antient Writer (*e*) *Juſtin Martyr* ſeems alſo to have had an eye to this Creed, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*; where, after a Paraphraſe upon the Rule of Faith concerning our Lord Chriſt, he introduces *Trypho*, as it were, repeating the Article of Chriſt's future Judgment, thus: *For to him it is given to judge all Men without exception, and his is the eternal Kingdom.* Now, I am of opinion, that the Clauſe [*whoſe Kingdom ſhall have no end,*] was deſign'd againſt the *Cerinthians*, who taught that thoſe glorious things ſpoken in Scripture concerning Chriſt's Kingdom, were to be underſtood of a certain, earthly, carnal, and even *Epicurean* Kingdom, which ſhould continue only a thouſand Years. There were indeed in the firſt Age after the Apoſtles, very many of the Catholicks (*Juſtin* alſo, whom I have cited, was one of them) who expected that Chriſt ſhould reign upon Earth a thouſand Years: but then their Opinion, though perhaps erroneous, was widely different from

(*a*) Pars 2. Tom. 1. p. 735. Athanaſius. (*b*) P. 737.
(*c*) P. 738. (*d*) Vide quæ ſequuntur de Synodis, *&c.*
(*e*) P. 264.

the

the *Cerinthian* Hereſy. For the Catholicks did not place the Happineſs of that Kingdom in the Gratifications of the Belly and the Fleſh, in Meats and Drinks, and Marriages; which, as *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* (*a*) informs us, was the obſcene and ſordid Opinion of *Cerinthus*; but expected a Kingdom, in which Peace ſhould flouriſh, Truth, Juſtice, and Piety ſhould prevail, and the holy Name of God ſhould be every where duly praiſed. Laſtly, the Catholicks only expected this temporary Kingdom of Chriſt, as a Prelude (if we may ſo ſpeak) of that heavenly Kingdom which they believed was to endure for ever.

17. From what we have diſcours'd, I ſuppoſe, it is now very clear, that the *Jeruſalem* Creed is very antient, and indeed no other than the old *Eaſtern* Creed, which the Apoſtolical Men compoſed as an Antidote againſt the manifold Hereſy of the *Gnoſticks*, that very inſolently exerted itſelf in thoſe Parts, juſt after the Deceaſe of the Apoſtles. Hence (*b*) *Cyril* calls it *the Holy Apoſtolical Faith, deliver'd to us for our Profeſſion.* Moreover, from theſe things, we may eaſily conclude it more antient than all the Creeds of the *Weſt*, not excepting the *Roman*. *Voſſius* reports it as a ſtrange and abſurd Opinion of a learned Man, *Joannes Rodolphus Lavaterus*, that he thought the Creed called the *Apoſtles*, was made out of the *Conſtantinopolitan*; and cites theſe Words of his concerning Chriſt's Deſcent into Hell: *I verily believe this Confeſſion (of the Council of* Conſtantinople) *was afterwards a little changed, and put off for the* Apoſtles Creed. Now I profeſs myſelf ſo far of this learned Man's Opinion, as to think the Creed called the *Apoſtles*, that is, the *Roman*, was made up out of the *Jeruſalem*, or antient *Eaſtern* Creed, with which the *Conſtantinopolitan* well agrees, except in the Additions made againſt *Arius* and *Macedonius*.

(*a*) Euſeb. E. H. p. 223. Lib. 7. cap. 25.
(*b*) Catech. 18. p. 501.

18. I will explain my Opinion more clearly in the following Positions: (1.) The Form, in which the Persons to be baptiz'd did antiently profess their Faith in the Holy Trinity, was simple, and conceiv'd generally in these Words, *I believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.* This is the allow'd Opinion of the most learned modern Divines, nor hath *Episcopius*, as we have seen already, dissented from it. (2.) The Hereticks would not suffer the Church long to enjoy this simple Confession of the Trinity: For whereas in the very times of the Apostles, there arose the *Simonians*, *Menandrians*, *Cerinthians*, and other Hereticks, of the same Stamp, who were very busy in privately corrupting the sound Doctrine concerning God the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit, and other chief Articles of Christianity; these false Apostles, soon after their Decease, began more audaciously to spread their Heresies. Hereupon, the Bishops of the Churches where the Hereticks gave disturbance, thought fit to compose a larger Confession of Faith, and require it of the Persons to be baptiz'd; namely, such an one as might more clearly expound the true Notion of the Trinity; adding also those other Articles of the Christian Faith, which the same Hereticks did in like manner oppose. (3.) Those first Hereticks arose in the *East*, and, for the most part, disturb'd the *Eastern* Churches alone, as hath been proved. (4.) Hence we easily gather, that the first larger Confession of Faith was made in the *East*; for where the Poison was first spread, there the Antidote was prepar'd. (5.) The Explanations and Additions which were made by the Orientals to the first and most simple Confession of Faith, were most of them (though some later than others) received into their Confession of Faith afterwards by the *Roman* and *Western* Churches. For in the times of *Ruffinus*, the Creeds of *Rome* and *Aquileia* had not [*Creator of Heaven and Earth*] in their Article concerning God the Father. For *Ruffinus* doth not explain these Words in the *Aquileian* Creed, nor tell us,

that

that they were added in the *Roman*. But it is plain, from what has been ſaid before, that the Clauſe concerning the Creation of all things by the ſupreme God, was put into the moſt antient *Eaſtern* Creeds, againſt the Hereſy of the *Gnoſticks*. Hence *Irenæus*, in his Rule of Faith, ſays expreſly, *The Maker of Heaven and Earth*. In the Article concerning the Church, the Word [*Catholick*] was wanting in the Creeds of *Rome* and *Aquileia* in *Ruffinus*'s days: for he does not explain it in that of *Aquileia*, nor obſerve that it was mention'd in that of *Rome*. Indeed the *Pammelian* Edition has it, but contrary to the Faith of the moſt antient Copies. What I ſhall obſerve next, may perhaps ſeem trivial, though indeed of very great Importance. The Article concerning the Belief of the Life Everlaſting (which, as we have ſeen, was in the *Eaſtern* Creed long before) was not in the Creeds of *Rome* and *Aquileia* till the times of *Ruffinus*; and afterwards, as (*a*) *Voſſius* hath plainly proved. See alſo the Notes of the (*b*) Biſhop of *Oxford*, *B. M.* upon the Synodical Epiſtle of St. *Cyprian*. But this Article was in the *African* Creed in St. *Cyprian*'s time, as we have proved before.

19. I ſaid that moſt, not all the Additions of the *Eaſtern* Churches, were received by the Church of *Rome* into her Rule of *Faith*. For thoſe things which ſeemed to abound in the *Eaſtern* Creed, or to be advanced againſt Hereſies, ſcarce known in the *Weſtern* Parts, the Church of *Rome* affecting Brevity, omitted in her Confeſſion. So in the firſt Article, concerning God the Father, ſhe received, though not very ſoon, thoſe Words [*Maker of Heaven and Earth*,] but not thoſe following [*and of all things viſible and inviſible*;] becauſe ſhe thought them contain'd in the former. Beſides, the People of *Rome* had ſcarce heard of thoſe Monſters, who aſſigned the viſible and inviſible things to different Authors. In the ſame, and the following

(*a*) De tribus Symbolis, *Diſſ.* 1. *Theſ.* 43. (*b*) P. 190.

Article,

Article, the *Roman* Church, as *Ruffinus* tells us, omitted the Word [*One*] *in One God*, &c. *and in One Lord Jesus*, which all the *Eastern* Churches had in their Creeds; because they knew little of those blasphemous Creatures who denied One God the Father, the Creator, or One Jesus Christ. Again, in the second Article, after the Words [*the Only-begotten Son of God*,] the Church of *Rome* hath not added what immediately follows in the *Eastern* Creed, [*begotten of the Father before all Ages*,] because they were in the Catechism instructed, and understood the latter Words to be virtually contain'd in the former. So those Words are wanting in the *Roman* Creed, which in the *Eastern* immediately follow in the seventh Article, concerning the Coming of Christ to judge the Quick and the Dead, namely, [*whose Kingdom shall have no end*,] because no Man at *Rome* had dreamt of *Cerinthus*'s Maggot. The eighth Article of the *Roman* Creed is without any Explication or Addition, just as we have it in the first and most simple Form [*I believe in the Holy Spirit*] which I have formerly much admired. For, as we have observ'd in the Articles concerning God the Father and the Son, the Church of *Rome* has borrowed some things from the *Eastern* Creeds to add to her own. Nay, further, after the Article concerning the Holy Spirit, she has added, in imitation of the *Eastern* Churches, certain Articles, namely, concerning the Church, the Remission of Sins, *&c.* Why, then, has she given us no Explication of the Article concerning the Holy Spirit? Why has she not imitated the *Eastern* Churches, and added [*Paraclete, who spoke by the Prophets*]? If indeed this Omission was designed, we may say, as before, that those Words were therefore omitted in the *Roman* Creed, because they struck at an Heresy which gave that Church no disturbance. Nor was there occasion of any Addition here, because, except that Heresy of the *Gnosticks* (which was not so much directed against the Holy Spirit, as the Law and the Prophets) there never arose any other,

that

that did profeſſedly and openly attempt the Dignity of the Holy Spirit before *Macedonius*, againſt whoſe Blaſphemy the *Conſtantinopolitan* Fathers made ſufficient proviſion. *Arius*, indeed, by denying the Son's Divinity, has by conſequence more ſtrongly denied the Divine Majeſty of the Holy Spirit. For the Heretick could not be ſo ſtupid, as to prefer the Holy Spirit before the Son of God (upon which account (*a*) *Epiphanius*, (*b*) *Ambroſe*, and (*c*) *Auſtin*, accuſe him of making the Holy Spirit the Creature of a Creature); but this was not his Aim, which alſo is a Reaſon why the Council of *Nice* hath defined nothing againſt him concerning the Holy Spirit. The Anti-Trinitarians, indeed, have in every Age choſe to attack the Divinity of the Son firſt, taking occaſion from many places of Scripture, which relate to his Incarnation, and what he undertook for our Salvation, (neglecting, or rather refuſing, very many places of the ſame Scripture, which plainly ſpeak his Divinity) a Pretence they could not have in oppoſing the Divinity of the Holy Spirit; and therefore were content indirectly, and by conſequence, to make this Point. However, this is obſervable, that ſome of the antient *Latin* Doctors, in expounding the Article of their Creed concerning the Holy Spirit, have had an eye to that Addition of the Orientals. Thus *Novatian*, *Cyprian's* Contemporary, and Presbyter of the Church of *Rome*, in his Rule of Faith, or, as we now call it, his Book of the Trinity, has theſe Words upon the Article concerning the Holy Spirit: (*d*) *But our Lord Chriſt ſometimes calls this Spirit the Paraclete, ſometimes pronounces him the Spirit of Truth, which is not new under the Goſpel, nor newly given. For this very* [Spirit] *accuſed the People by the Prophets, and accompliſh'd the calling of the* Gentiles *by the Apoſtles.* And a little after, *It is then one and the ſame Spirit, which was in the Prophets and the Apoſtles*, &c.

(*a*) Hæreſ. 69. n. 52, & 56. (*b*) Ambr. de Symbol. cap. 2.
(*c*) De Hæreſ. cap. 69. (*d*) P. 727.

Here

Here we have the Senſe and Meaning of the Words [*the Paraclete, who ſpake by the Prophets*] clearly explain'd, namely this, that there was not one Spirit under the Old Teſtament, and another under the New; not one of the Prophets, and another of the Apoſtles: but that one and the ſame Spirit which inſpir'd the Apoſtles, ſpoke alſo by the antient Prophets, contrary to what the aforeſaid Hereticks taught. In like manner *Ruffinus*, in his Expoſition of the Creed, after he had obſerv'd that the Divinity of the Holy Spirit was hinted, by the way of expreſſing it, [*I believe in the Holy Spirit*] not [*I believe the Holy Spirit*] immediately adds, *It was therefore the Holy Spirit, who, under the Old Teſtament, inſpired the Law and the Prophets; and, under the New, the Goſpel and the Apoſtles.* Laſtly, The tenth Article of the *Roman* Creed, of the Remiſſion of Sins, is plainly nothing but a piece of an Article, expreſs'd more fully in the old *Eaſtern* Creed, thus: *I believe in one Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of Sins*; or, as the *Conſtantinopolitan* Fathers give it us, *I confeſs one Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of Sins.* Now the *Romans* ſeem to me to have omitted the former Part of this Article, becauſe under no Apprehenſions from the *Gnoſtick* Hereſy concerning that Sacrament, which I mention'd before. But notwithſtanding that in all the preceding Obſervations, the *Roman* Creed is more contracted than the *Eaſtern*, yet it is now, by two entire Articles, more large than it; namely, in theſe, concerning the Deſcent of Chriſt into Hell, and the Communion of Saints. Learned Men (*a*), indeed, have, ſome time ſince, obſerv'd, that theſe Articles were not antiently in the *Roman* Creed. Thus you have my Reaſons for believing the *Eaſtern* Creed, explained by *Cyril*, more antient than the *Roman*, called the *Apoſtles*; and the one, the *Roman*, compil'd and deriv'd from the other, the *Eaſtern*.

(*a*) *See* Voſſius de tribus Symbolis, *Diſſert.* 1. *Theſ.* 34. *and the Notes upon the* 70*th Epiſtle of St.* Cyprian, p. 190. *Ed.* Oxon.

20. I will add one Obſervation more, and ſo conclude this long Diſſertation concerning the antient Creeds. It is to be obſerv'd, then, that the *Arians* themſelves, in their Confeſſions of Faith, cited before in this Chapter, have given us the Article concerning the Son of God, almoſt after the ſame manner as it is in the *Jeruſalem* Creed. For thus their firſt Confeſſion has it. (*a*) *And in one Only-begotten Son of God, who exiſted before all Ages, and was with the Father that begat him, by whom all things were made.* Thus, again, another Confeſſion, immediately following the former: *And in one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, his Only-begotten Son, God, by whom are all things, God, begotten of his Father before Ages.* Thus *Theophronius*'s Confeſſion: *And in one Only-begotten Son, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, begotten, perfect God of the Father before Ages.* Where *perfect God* is, no doubt, equivalent to *true God* in the *Jeruſalem* Creed. So the Confeſſion of the ſame [*Arians*] ſent by *Narciſſus*, and others, into *France*, to be deliver'd to *Conſtans: And in his Only-begotten Son, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, begotten God of the Father before all Ages, by whom all things were made.* Thus almoſt all their Confeſſions, which follow in *Athanaſius*, give us the Article. Now they ſay, that in theſe Confeſſions, they have religiouſly obſerv'd the Rule of Faith deliver'd down from the Beginning. Thus in the Preface to their firſt Confeſſion, *We have not received any other Faith, than that which was deliver'd from the Beginning:* Thus they begin the Confeſſion, *We have learnt from the Beginning to believe*, &c. Thus alſo another of their Confeſſions, *We believe agreeable to Evangelical and Apoſtolical Tradition.* From this we again conclude, that the ſpecial Mode of the Filiation of Jeſus Chriſt, concerning which *Epiſcopius* diſputes, namely, that by which he, in his more excellent Nature, was begotten God of God the Father *before all Ages, by whom all things were made*, was plainly declar'd

(*a*) Athanaſius. Pars 2. Tom. 1. p. 735, &c.

in the Creed, or Creeds, extant in the *Eaſtern* Churches before the Council of *Nice*, juſt as we have found it in the Creed of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, the moſt antient of all the Churches of the *Eaſt*. For the *Arians* were Orientals, who ſet forth thoſe Confeſſions; and that, as they profeſs, according to the Rule of Faith receiv'd in their Churches from the Beginning.

21. Hence it alſo appears, that thoſe *Arians* were ſelf-condemn'd: For in confeſſing that the Son of God was begotten of God before all Ages, that he was true or perfect God, and that the Creatures were made by him, they have confuted their own Opinion. What ſober Man will believe that nothing elſe is meant by this Confeſſion, than that the Son of God was a mere Creature, made of nothing, though before all other Creatures, which was the *Arian* Tenet? How was he before all Ages, who only receiv'd the beginning of Exiſtence, in the beginning of the Creation, in the firſt Moment of the firſt Age? How could he be God, true and perfect God, and create all things of nothing, who himſelf was a mere Creature? For, as (*a*) *Athanaſius* has well obſerv'd, *It is not poſſible that the things made, and he that made them, ſhould have one Generation.* Laſtly, How could he be begotten of God, who was made of nothing? Upon this account, the great (*b*) *Athanaſius* ſharply reproves the *Arians*, from their own Confeſſions; *Even you have wrote, that the Son is begotten of the Father. If then when you name the Father, or God, you don't mean the Eſſence, or he that is, according to his Eſſence; but ſomething, I can't tell what, about him, or inferior to him: you ſhould not write that the Son is from the Father, but from ſomething circumſtantial to, or inherent in him; that ſo avoiding the calling him truly God the Father, and conceiving him that is ſimple, to be compound and corporeal, ye might be the Inventers of a new Blaſphemy.* And a little after, (*c*) *Ye have ſaid that*

(*a*) Tom. 1. pars 2. p. 751. (*b*) P. 750. (*c*) Ibidem.

the

the Son is of God, namely, ye have said that he is of the Essence of the Father. Moreover, granting that the Words of the antient Creed will bear the *Arian* Sense, it is certain the primitive Church, which used that Creed, understood them in another more noble Sense. For the Catholick Doctors before *Arius*, how uncautiously or obscurely soever some of them have sometimes spoken upon this Question concerning our Lord's Divinity, yet all of them, with one consent, have confess'd the Son of God to be begotten of God the Father, so as to be born of his very Essence, and to be really God, as we have proved throughout the whole second Section of our *Defence* of the *Nicene Creed.* In vain then did the *Arians* boast, that they had not in the least receded from the antient Rule of Faith, since they only held the Words of that Rule, not the true primitive Sense of it.

22. Lastly, It is hence manifest, that the Synod of *Nice* did well, did necessarily advance the Clause of the Consubstantiality, against those impious Comments of the *Arians*, and for the asserting the true and genuine Sense of that Article of the old Creed, concerning the Son of God. Instead of what stood in the old Creed [*The Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all Worlds, true God, by whom all things were made,*] the *Nicene* Fathers have given us, *The Only-begotten, begotten of the Father, that is, of the Father's Essence; God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, of one Substance with the Father, by whom all things were made.* Where we see the Words of the old Creed after [*Only-begotten*] namely [*begotten of the Father before all Ages*] left out, to make way for the Clause of the Consubstantiality. But the *Constantinopolitan* Fathers retain'd those Words, adding what was sufficient concerning the Consubstantiality out of the *Nicene* Creed, thus: [*The Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all Ages, God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all*

things were made.] Now it is plain, nothing was here added to the old *Eastern* Creed, which was not virtually in it before. For he who was begotten of God the Father before all Ages, was true God; and he by whom all things were made, can't but be consubstantial, that is, of the same Nature or Essence with the Father; (which is all the Fathers intended by the Word) and thus all Catholicks always understood the Words of the old Creed, before the *Arian* Controversy arose.

23. To draw the whole matter into a short compass: Since it is agreed between the *Catholicks* and *Arians*, that all are oblig'd, by the primitive Rule of Faith, to believe in the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of God the Father before all Ages, true, or (as the *Arians* would rather speak) perfect God, by whom all things were made; the Question is only this, Whether side hath interpreted this Rule better, more agreeably to the obvious Sense of the Words, and the receiv'd Meaning of the Church; the *Arians*, who have taught that the Son of God is nothing else but the first Creature, made of nothing by God, (for after all their colours, this is their real Sentiment;) or the *Catholicks*, who believ'd him to be very God, of the same Nature or Essence with God the Father? Sure there is no room for a Doubt, since it is very clear, that the *Catholicks* only have kept to the genuine Sense of this Rule, and the *Arians* have departed from it, and consequently left the Rule itself as much as possible. * Every one then may easily determine concerning

* *The case is very clear with respect to the* Arians. *They have defin'd the Son of God to be the chief of all Creatures, and made of nothing. The* Semi-Arians *also, who taught that the Word was born of the Father, and therefore of a like Nature; but not begotten of the Substance of God the Father, and of the same Nature, went off as well from the proper Signification of the Words in their own, and in the Catholick Creeds, as from the antient Sense of the Fathers. For as* Athanasius *observes, that which is naturally begotten of any one, and not acquir'd from without, Nature owns as a Son, and that is the very*

cerning the *Theodotians*, *Artemonites*, *Samosatenians*, *Photinians*, and the Monsters of our own Age, the *Socinians*, (in the Defence of whose Cause *Episcopius* hath neither been afraid nor asham'd to appear.)

Having thus discover'd, and accurately examin'd the Creeds which were in the Church before the Council of *Nice*, it is now sufficiently clear how vainly *Episcopius* attempted to prove, *That in the primitive Churches, from the times of the Apostles, for three entire Centuries at least, that special Mode of Jesus Christ's Filiation, by which he was begotten of God the Father before all Ages, and consequently was himself God, was not judg'd necessary to be known and believ'd in order to Salvation.* We have certainly proved the contrary Assertion from the same Creeds. Let us proceed now, by the Assistance of Christ our Saviour, and our God, to dispatch what remains.

Notes upon the 5th, 6th, and 7th Chapters.

Concerning the first Draughts of a Confession of Faith made in Baptism; of the Filling up, and Finishings of it, in the Age, and by the Authority or Permission of the Apostles.

I Am sensible my Attempt to prove the first Elements of the Apostles Creed, the Additions afterwards made, and the finishing of it, to have been compass'd in the time of the Apostles, and by their Advice or

very Meaning of the Word. Hence, if the Semi-Arians *had meant that the Word of God was indeed begotten of the Father, and was properly a Son, they would have confess'd that he was born of the very Substance of the Father, and coessential with him. Thus most of the holy* Ante-Nicene *Fathers have in Sense taught, and some of them in express Words. See* Sect. 2. *of the Defence of the* Nicene Creed. [Dr. Grabe's *Note.*]

Permiſſion, is a Matter of great Moment, grown obſcure by Age, and made more ſo by the novel Comments of many. The Aſſertion of *Epiſcopius* we may well place in this Claſs, that the moſt antient Creed, and that uſed in the firſt Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, was, *I believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt* (*a*) To this the Reverend *Bull* has expreſly anſwer'd, (*b*) *That that was never taken for a full and perfect Creed, expreſly comprehending in it all the neceſſary Articles of Faith.* This he has alſo learnedly prov'd, (*c*) that the *Weſtern*, as well as the *Eaſtern*, Church, uſed a more large and explicit Creed in the Sacrament of Baptiſm before the Synod of *Nice*, than that mention'd by *Epiſcopius: I believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.* In particular, he hath (*d*) demonſtrated, that the Creed of both the Churches before the Synod of *Nice*, did not end in the Article [*I believe in the Holy Ghoſt*] but that thoſe other Articles concerning the Church, the Remiſſion of Sins, the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, and the Life of the World to come, had then been a long time added. But what if from an accurate Conſideration of Holy Scriptures, and juſt Conſequences from them, it ſhould appear, (1.) That the firſt Lines of the Creed uſed by the Apoſtles, in the moſt antient Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, were larger than *Epiſcopius*'s, *I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit?* (2.) That that Creed ſoon receiv'd ſuch Additions, as that in the Apoſtles time, and by their Authority, or at leaſt Permiſſion, it grew to be as large as the Creed called the *Apoſtles*, and had in it all the Articles of that except two, namely, thoſe concerning the Deſcent into Hell, and the Communion of Saints.

2. In order to prove both theſe Propoſitions, with what Brevity and Clearneſs the ſubject Matter of them will allow, I premiſe two Things: That the firſt Chriſtians, whether of the *Jews*, or of the *Gen-*

(*a*) Chap. 4. Sect. 1. (*b*) Sect. 3. (*c*) Chap. 6. (*d*) Sect. 7.

tiles,

tiles, obſerv'd that, in the ſolemn Profeſſion of their Faith before Baptiſm, either by their own Inclination, or the Command of the Apoſtles, which Reaſon dictates, and the Uſe of all Times confirms to have been obſerv'd by all who came over from one Sect to another; namely, to confeſs the Truth of the Articles, call'd Fundamental, of that Church to which they came over, directly oppoſite to the Errors of that Sect they left. (2.) That the ſame Primitive Believers, before they received the Sacraments, did teſtify their Aſſent to thoſe Heads of Chriſtian Doctrine in which they had been catechiz'd: For thoſe Heads were not only deliver'd to them, that they ſhould embrace them with their Heart, but alſo profeſs them with their Tongue. Thus the (*a*) *Apoſtle*, after he hath mention'd the Word of Faith, adds, that, *If you confeſs the Lord Jeſus with the Mouth, and believe in the Heart that God rais'd him from the dead, you ſhall be ſav'd: For with the Heart we believe unto Righteouſneſs, and with the Tongue Confeſſion is made to Salvation.* But if any Defender of *Epiſcopius*, or other Perſon whatſoever, ſhall deny me theſe Suppoſitions, I know not how he will be able to perſuade himſelf, or any others, that the Confeſſion of Faith, *I believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, or any other, was made by the firſt Diſciples of the Apoſtles. Omitting therefore any further Proof of theſe Premiſes, I proceed to prove what I build upon them.

3. As for the firſt Article, *I believe in God the Father*, that it was enlarg'd from the very firſt Converſion of the *Pagans*, by theſe, or the like Words, [*One, Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth*] I thus prove by virtue of the Premiſes: The chief Error of the Heathen, at leaſt the promiſcuous Multitude, was a Perſuaſion that there were many Gods; one of the Heaven, another of the Earth, a third of the Sea, *&c.* and the vain Adoration of them. Hence the (*b*) *Apoſtle*: *Then*

(*a*) Rom. 10. 8, 9, 10. (*b*) Gal. 4. 8.

indeed not knowing God, ye ſerv'd thoſe who are not Gods by Nature. On the other hand, the primary Article of the Chriſtian Faith is concerning the one true God, on whom all things in Heaven, in Earth, and the Sea depend, and of whom (*c*) St. *Paul*'s Words are worthy our Notice and Conſideration: *Tho there be that are call'd Gods, both in Heaven and in Earth* (among the Heathen) *for there are Gods many, and Lords many; yet to us* (Chriſtians) *there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him.* Upon this account, the (*d*) *Apoſtle*, in his firſt Sermons, preach'd to them the one true God Almighty, warning them to be converted from theſe vain Idols to the Living God, as we have it concerning *Paul* and *Barnabas*. In like manner, St. *Paul* declar'd the unknown God to the ſame *Athenians*, ſaying, (*e*) *Whom ye ignorantly worſhip, him we preach to you: God who made the World, and all things in it, being Lord of Heaven and Earth*, &c. Who can doubt then, but that the Confeſſion of one Almighty God was chiefly requir'd of the Heathen Proſelytes? You'll ſay that the Heathens believ'd one ſupreme God, upon whom all things depended, and therefore there was no occaſion that they ſhould be inſtructed in it by the Chriſtians, or confeſs it. I anſwer, it is very true of the Philoſophers, and more learned Men among them; but for the meaner ſort, that moſt of them knew not that there was one true God, and that he was Almighty, the Words of the *Apoſtle* to the *Galatians* aforecited fully prove. Now ſince moſt of the *new Heathen* Converts were of the meaner ſort, and ignorant in (*f*) *Philoſophy*, it was neceſſary they ſhould be taught the Knowledge of the One Almighty God, and that they ſhould confeſs it before Baptiſm. But the more learned Heathens alſo, tho they determin'd

(*c*) 1 Cor. 8. 6. (*d*) Acts 17. 23. (*e*) Acts 17. 23.
(*f*) 1 Cor. 1. 26, 27.

that

that there was one God, yet were ignorant, or rather obſtinately deny'd that he made the Heavens, the Earth, the Seas, and all things therein out of nothing. Upon which account the Apoſtles, in their Inſtruction of the *Gentiles*, when they mention the one God, immediately add, that he created the Heaven, the Earth, and the Sea, as is plain from the aforecited Sermon of St. *Paul* to the *Athenians*; and alſo from another (*g*) Place, where, after theſe Words [*the Living God*] he adds, *who made the Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that in them is.* Thus in the end of the World, when the Fulneſs of the *Gentiles* ſhall be brought over to the true God, the Angel, who hath the eternal Goſpel to preach to all that dwell upon the Earth, every Nation, Tribe, Tongue, and People, will ſay, (*h*) *Fear the Lord and adore him, who made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea and the Fountains of Waters.* The *Gentiles* therefore being ſolemnly to repeat their Creed, were eſpecially to profeſs in it, that they believ'd in *one God Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth*; whom they had hitherto not known, or deny'd, but were now taught by the Chriſtians.

4. I can't therefore ſubſcribe to the Opinion of certain Learned Men, who think the Words aforeſaid were added to the Creed in the ſecond Century, againſt the *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, and other *Gnoſticks*, becauſe they deny'd the Unity of God, and the ſupreme Omnipotence of the Creator of the World; as is clear from *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and others who wrote againſt them. For it is no leſs clear from the ſame Authors, that they urg'd that very Confeſſion of one God the Creator, in the Creed, as receiv'd from the Apoſtles themſelves. Thus (*i*) *Irenæus*, after he had mention'd the unmoveable Rule of Faith which every one receives in Baptiſm, he ſubjoins it with this Preface: (*k*) *For the Church, tho diſpers'd through the whole World, even to the Ends of the Earth, having received from*

(*g*) Acts 14. 14. (*h*) Apocal. 14. 6, 7. (*i*) Lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 40. (*k*) Cap. 2. p. 50.

the

the Apoſtles, and their Diſciples, the Faith in one God the Father Almighty, who hath made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and all that in them is. And (*l*) afterwards, *Since then we hold the Rule of Truth, that there is one God Almighty, who made all things by his Word.* Again, he mentions the old Tradition (*m*), and reciting it briefly, ſays: *They believe in one God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things therein* (*n*). Laſtly, he ſays (*o*): *The entire Faith is in one God Almighty, of whom are all things,* [by Creation.] In like manner (*p*) *Tertullian: That is the Rule of Faith, by which we believe that there is only one God, and that he is no other than the Maker of the World.* Again, reciting the Creed, he ſays (*q*): *In one only God Almighty, Maker of the World.* Now he expreſly writes (*r*), that *this Rule has come down to us from the beginning of the Goſpel.* From theſe and many other Teſtimonies of the Antients, which I omit for brevity ſake, it is plain, that they oppos'd the Confeſſion of one God the Creator to the Hereticks, as what was deliver'd, in the beginning of the Goſpel, by the Apoſtles themſelves. But they had dealt deceitfully and very abſurdly, they had expos'd themſelves to the Hatred and Deriſion of the Hereticks, if they had attempted to confute them by a Clauſe of the Creed lately advanc'd by the Biſhops their Adverſaries, and had pretended it to be an Apoſtolical Tradition. Therefore it was not oppos'd to the Doctrine of the Hereticks by the Biſhops, but to the Error of the Heathens by the Apoſtles, and by them made an Article of the Creed.

5. In the ſecond Article of the Creed, *Epiſcopius* hath falſly aſſerted, that there was only mention of the Title [*Son*;] for the Names *Jeſus Chriſt* are expreſly read in the *Confeſſion* of *Candace*'s Eunuch, Queen of *Æthiopia* (*s*): *I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* But neither is this to be eſteem'd a compleat

(*l*) Cap. 19. p. 114. (*m*) Lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 242. (*n*) Lib. 2. cap. 9. p. 158. (*o*) Lib. 4. cap. 62. p. 399. (*p*) Tert. p. 206. (*q*) P. 173. (*r*) P. 501. (*s*) Acts 8. 37.

Pro-

Profeſſion of Faith concerning the Son of God. For it will be no good Concluſion that the Eunuch ſaid no more, becauſe St. *Luke* has not told us that he did; eſpecially when it appears from other Places of the (*t*) *Acts*, that *Luke* ſometimes abridg'd the Speeches of others. So in the Hiſtory of St. *Paul*'s *Converſion* we only read theſe Words of *Ananias* to him; *Brother* Saul, *the Lord who appear'd to thee in the way, as thou cameſt, hath ſent me, that thou ſhouldſt receive thy ſight, and be fill'd with the Holy Ghoſt.* But the Apoſtle himſelf, *afterwards*, gives us theſe additional Words of Ananias: (*u*) *The God of our Fathers hath preordain'd thee, that thou ſhouldſt know his Will, and ſee the juſt one, and hear the Word of his Mouth; for thou ſhalt be his Witneſs to all Men of thoſe things thou haſt ſeen and heard. And now why tarrieſt thou? Ariſe, and be baptiz'd, and waſh away thy Sins, calling upon him.* Who can doubt whether the Eunuch teſtify'd his Aſſent to thoſe things which *Philip* had preach'd concerning the Paſſion, Death, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, upon the Words of *Iſaiah*; *He was led as a Sheep to the Slaughter?* Thus it is alſo a Conſequence of our *Hypotheſis*, that others, before Baptiſm, made a Profeſſion of the Articles mention'd, in which they had been inſtructed before. For, (1.) it is clear that the (*x*) *Apoſtles* preach'd the Paſſion, Death, and Reſurrection of Jeſus to the *Jews*, as well as the *Gentiles*. Whence *Paul* ſaid to *Agrippa*, that he teſtify'd to Small and Great, that Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and ſhould, firſt riſing from the dead, ſhew Light to the People and the *Gentiles*. The *Words* of the ſame (*y*) St. *Paul* are very obſervable, where he ſays, *I have deliver'd to you principally what I alſo receiv'd, that Chriſt died for our Sins according to the Scripture, and that he was bury'd, and that he roſe again the third Day according to the Scriptures.* Theſe are three Members of the Article concerning Chriſt, expreſs'd in the ſame order as in the Apoſtles Creed, which the

(*t*) Acts 9. 17. (*u*) Acts 22. 14. (*x*) Acts 2. 22, *&c.* 3. 13, *&c.* 10. 36, *&c.* 13. 27, *&c.* 26. 22, 23. (*y*) 1 Cor. 15. 3, 4.

Apoſtle

Apoſtle ſays he deliver'd as principal Heads of Faith to the *Corinthians*. And no wonder, for the *Jews* obſtinately deny'd the Death and Paſſion of Chriſt, or the *Meſſiah*, and the Reſurrection of Jeſus: The *Gentiles* ridicul'd both. Whence the Apoſtle writes to the ſame *Perſons* thus: (z) *We preach Chriſt crucify'd, to the* Jews *a Stumbling-block, and to the* Greeks *Fooliſhneſs; but to them that are call'd,* Jews *and* Greeks, *Chriſt the Power and Wiſdom of God.* By virtue then of our other Suppoſition, both of them, before their Baptiſm, did profeſs the chief Articles of the Faith, which were rejected on both ſides, either by their own Inclination, or upon the Apoſtles Command.

6. What follows after *the Reſurrection* of Chriſt, *his Aſcenſion into Heaven, his ſitting at the right Hand of God the Father, and his return to judge the Quick and the Dead,* were without doubt deny'd by, or unknown to the *Jews* and *Gentiles*. Hereupon, when our Saviour ſpoke of eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood, and *his Diſciples murmur'd at it, he ſaid to them; Doth this offend you? What if ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend where he was before* (a)? As tho his Aſcenſion ſhould yet ſeem more abſurd to them, than the Myſtery of eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood. And indeed when our Lord had ſaid before the High Prieſt, (b) *Hereafter ye ſhall ſee the Son of Man ſitting at the right Hand of Power, and coming in the Clouds of Heaven; the High Prieſt rent his Clothes, ſaying, he hath blaſphemed, what need have we of further Witneſſes? Behold now ye have heard his Blaſphemies, what think ye? And they anſwering, ſaid, he is guilty of Death.* Hence St. *Peter*, the Prince of the Apoſtles and Prieſts of the New Teſtament, in his Catechetical Diſcourſes, as well to the *Jews* as the *Gentiles*, made mention of the Aſcenſion of Chriſt into Heaven, or his Exaltation to the right Hand of God, to rule over all things, and to

(z) 1 Cor. 1. 23, 24. (a) Joh. 6. 61, 62. (b) Mat. 26. 64, 65, 66.

paſs

pass Judgment in the end upon the *Living* and the *Dead.* (*c*) He testifies also, in his Discourse to *Cornelius*, that he does this by the Command of *Christ: And he hath commanded us to preach to the People, and to testify that he is appointed by God the Judge of Quick and Dead.* Upon our Suppositions, we may again conclude from these things, that the *Jews* and *Gentiles* lately converted, and to be baptiz'd, did make a just Confession of these Articles also.

7. I am therefore forc'd to disagree with a late Learned Writer upon the History of the Apostles Creed, who thinks the Article concerning the Ascension of Christ was added to this Creed in the second Century, against *Apelles* the Disciple of *Marcion*, of whom the Author of the Appendix to *Tertullian's* Book of Prescription, *&c.* writes thus: (*d*) *He neither says that Christ was only a Phantom, as* Marcion; *nor in the Substance of a true Body, as the Gospel teaches: but that when he descended from the higher Regions, in the very Descent that he made himself a heavenly and aerial Body, and that in his Resurrection and Ascent, he restor'd to all the several Elements, what in his Descent he had borrow'd of them*; and *so all the Parts of his Body being dispers'd, he only brought the Spirit again into Heaven.* For from these Words, and those of other Fathers, concerning *Apelles*, it is plain he did not absolutely deny the Ascension of Christ, but of Christ's Flesh into Heaven. If then the Fathers had advanc'd this Article against that Error, they would not barely have said, He ascended into Heaven; but they would have affirm'd the Assumption of his Flesh into Heaven, as (*e*) *Irenæus* doth, having very probably this Heresy of *Apelles* in his mind, tho he doth not mention it. Thus, if this Article had been levell'd at the Maggot of *Hermogenes*, that the Body of our Lord was lodg'd in the Sun, Christ would have been said to have ascended with his Body above all Heavens, above every Star. By a

(*c*) Acts 2. 33, *&c.* 3. 20, 21. 10. 42. (*d*) P. 223.
(*e*) P. 50. lib. 1. cap. 2.

Parity

Parity of Reaſon in thoſe Articles concerning his Seſſion at the right Hand of God, and his coming to judge the Quick and the Dead, if one of them had been oppos'd to thoſe who ſaid that our Saviour's Fleſh ſate in Heaven void of Senſe, and like an empty Scabbard, the Chriſt being *drawn out* (*f*); or the other had been advanc'd partly againſt the Hereſy of the *Marcionites*, who deny'd that God the Father of Chriſt was juſt, or a Judge; partly againſt the *Gnoſticks*, who took away Free-will, as the Learned Perſon aforecited thinks; both of them would have been conceiv'd, if not in more Words, in ſuch as ſhould have been more direct to the Points. But now, that the Authors of the Creed have taught the Catechumens to profeſs that Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God *aſcended into Heaven, ſits at the right Hand of God the Father, and ſhall come from thence to judge the Quick and the Dead*, in plain general Terms; we muſt think that they intended this Confeſſion for thoſe who as yet deny'd, or were abſolutely ignorant of theſe things; namely, the *Jews* and *Gentiles* converted to the Faith.

8. What ſhall we ſay to the Articles which precede the *Paſſion, Death, Reſurrection*, &c. namely, *the Conception of Jeſus Chriſt by the Holy Spirit*, and his *Nativity of the Virgin* Mary? Did the *Jews* and *Gentiles* from the Beginning own theſe before Baptiſm? Indeed I'm in ſome doubt about this, in the very beginnings of Chriſtianity; becauſe there is no mention of the Conception by Power of the Holy Spirit, without Human Seed, or the Nativity of the Virgin *Mary* in any Catechetical Diſcourſe in the *Acts*; nor do we read any where, that the Apoſtles preach'd them to the *Jews* or *Gentiles*, or that they were diſputed againſt by the one or the other, as is plain, concerning the Reſurrection. We may well ſuppoſe, then, that the Publication of this Myſtery was reſerv'd to a more full Expoſition of the Goſpel after Baptiſm; becauſe it ſeem'd

(*f*) Tertull. p. 325. de carne Chriſti,

plainly

plainly impoſſible to all univerſally, *Iſraelites*, and others, that a Virgin ſhould bring forth without a Man *(a)*, or becauſe a Knowledge of the ſupernatural Conception and Nativity of Chriſt was not ſo neceſſary, as the Belief of his Paſſion and Reſurrection. Hence there is not only nothing ſaid of the former, in any Diſcourſes of the Apoſtles, as I ſaid before, but it is alſo omitted in ſome of the Goſpels. St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke* indeed largely deſcribe it; St. *Mark* (to ſay nothing of St. *John*) has not a word about it: but all of them have expreſly enlarg'd upon the latter, and afterwards none of the four Evangeliſts have omitted to give a long Account of it. Now there is no doubt, but that not long after the Foundations of Chriſtianity were laid, and eſpecially after the Goſpels were publiſh'd, both *Jews* and *Gentiles* began to oppoſe the wonderful Birth and Conception of our Lord, and thence an occaſion was given, and a neceſſity impos'd upon the Converts of both to confeſs his immaculate Conception and Nativity, as well as the other Articles of Faith. I cannot therefore think the opinion of thoſe Learned Men probable, who pretend thoſe things, of which I have hitherto diſcourſed, were added to the Creed againſt the Hereſy of *Carpocrates*, *Cerinthus*, and the *Ebionites*, (who impiouſly aſſerted that Chriſt was begotten of *Joſeph* and *Mary*.) Tho' ſuppoſing, but not granting this, it may ſtill be, that the ſaid Additions to the Creed, are owing to Apoſtolical Authority, or Permiſſion at leaſt; for that execrable Hereſy had then its helliſh Riſe, when St. *John*, and perhaps others of the Apoſtles *were yet alive.(b)*

9. I proceed to the third Branch of the Apoſtles Creed concerning the Holy Spirit, in whom (as *Epiſcopius* himſelf well affirms) the Diſciples of the Apoſtles teſtified their belief in Baptiſm; but others falſly deny it, thinking the Knowledge and Profeſſion

(*a*) *See the Paſſage of* Juſtin *in his Dialogue with* Trypho, *cited* Ch. 7. Sect. 4. *hereafter.*

(*b*) *See* Irenæus, Lib. 3. Cap. 3. pag. 233.

of

of Jesus Christ the Son of God to be only necessary. The *History* of the (*a*) *Acts* is a sufficient Confutation of these Men. But then what is to be said for the following Articles of the Creed? Let us consider them particularly, beginning with the Remission of Sins; for the Article of the *Church* in the most ancient Creeds, or at least in the Creeds of many Churches, is not placed immediately after that of the Holy Spirit, but in a lower, and sometimes in the last place, as is plain from our Learned Author's Observations in this very Chapter. Now both *Peter* and *Paul* did expressly teach the *Jews* and *Gentiles* in their first Instructions, that Remission of Sins was obtain'd by Christ, and given to the Faithful by Baptism into his Name. St. *Peter* (*b*) in his first Sermon at *Jerusalem*, says, *Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, for the Remission of Sins.* (From hence, by the way, the Article of the antient *Hierosolymitan* Creed seems to be form'd, *I believe in one Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins.*) He also concludes his first Discourse to the *Gentiles* with this Doctrine, saying, (*c*) *To him* [Christ] *give all the Prophets witness, that all who believe in him shall receive Remission of Sins by his Name.* Thus (*d*) St. *Paul*: *Be it known to you Men and Brethren, that by him is preach'd unto you Remission of Sins, and that every one who believes is by him justified from all things, from which he could not be justified by the Law of* Moses. Nor is it to be admir'd, for our Saviour himself after his Resurrection told his Apostles, That *Repentance and Remission of Sins must be preach'd to all Nations in his Name, beginning at* Jerusalem, *&c.* (*e*) Therefore as the Apostles and their Successors delivered this Sum of the Gospel, and the advantage of the whole Dispensation of the Son of God expounded in the preceding Words of the Creed, in their Catechetical Discourses; so on the other hand there is no

(*a*) Chap. 19. 2. (*b*) Acts 2. 38. (*c*) Acts 10. 43.
(*d*) Acts 13. 38, 39. (*e*) Luke 24. 27.

doubt

doubt but that the Catechumens profeſs'd the ſame in their Creed before Baptiſm. That ſome did now and then profeſs this, in the very Beginnings of Chriſtianity, the above cited Author of the Hiſtory of the Apoſtles Creed confeſſes; but then he determines, that the conſtant mention of Remiſſion of Sins in the Confeſſion of Faith only obtain'd in the days of St. *Cyprian*, upon the account of Hereticks, eſpecially the *Novatians*, who deny'd that the Church had a power of forgiving Sins committed after Baptiſm. Now this Conjecture can't be allow'd, becauſe in the *Novatian* Creed this Article of Remiſſion of Sins was *expreſly mention'd*, as St. *Cyprian* (*x*) teſtifies in theſe words: *But if any one ſhall anſwer, that* Novatian *obſerv'd the ſame Rule with the Catholicks, namely, to baptize with the ſame Creed as we; let him know, whoſoever he is, that we and the Schiſmaticks have not the ſame Rule of Faith, nor the ſame Interrogatory. For when they ſay,* Doſt thou believe the Remiſſion of Sins, and the Life everlaſting, by the Holy Church? *they are wrong in their Interrogatory, becauſe they have no Church*, &c. But beſides, it is not probable that the *Novatians* would place, or retain in their Confeſſion of Faith, *the Remiſſion of Sins by the Holy Church, unleſs they had ſeen the ſame receiv'd into the Creeds of all other Churches.* Laſtly, if the Profeſſion of Remiſſion of Sins, not uſed before in ſome Churches, had been at length inſerted into their Creed againſt the *Novatian* Rigour, either mention would have been made of Sins committed after Baptiſm, or ſome ſuch Phraſe would have been uſed. But, on the other hand, we read in all of them either Remiſſion of Sins in general, or one Baptiſm of Repentance, or one Baptiſm for Remiſſion of Sins; the former of which doth not at all contradict the *Novatian* Hereſy, and the latter may ſeem to favour it. What the learned Man objects, that no mention is made of Remiſſion of Sins in the Accounts given of

(*x*) *See this Place cited before.*

the Creed by *Tertullian* and *Origen*, may be thus briefly anſwer'd, That the Hereticks, to whom they oppos'd the Apoſtolical Rule of Faith, did not deny the Remiſſion of Sins, were not known by them to deny it, and that therefore they had no occaſion to mention this Article. However, our Reverend *Author* has ingenuouſly ſhewn, that both *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* alluded to it in their Writings (*y*).

10. The *Learned Author* of the Hiſtory of the Apoſtles Creed (*z*), thinks the Reſurrection of the Dead was inſerted from the very Beginnings of Chriſtianity. This I doubt of a little, becauſe the Catechetical Diſcourſes of St. *Peter* (*a*) and St. *Paul* conclude with *the Remiſſion of Sins*, nor does the latter mention the Reſurrection of the Dead in his Sermon to the *Athenians* (*b*), but only the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the Dead; tho indeed his Auditors ſeem from that to infer the univerſal Reſurrection of the *Dead*. For it is ſaid, *When they heard of the Reſurrection from the Dead, ſome of them derided it, but others ſaid, Let us hear thee concerning this Matter again.* From theſe words we are to take our Explication of what is ſaid of St. *Paul*, ver. 18. *That he preach'd to them Jeſus and the Reſurrection*, that is, *the Reſurrection of Jeſus, or begun in Jeſus*; as it is alſo written of the other Apoſtles, (*c*) *And with great Power the Apoſtles gave Teſtimony of the Reſurrection of the Lord Jeſus.* Further, when ſome aroſe among the (*d*) *Corinthians*, who ſaid there was no Reſurrection of the Dead, the Apoſtle puts them in mind of what he had preach'd there, ſays that he had firſt of all deliver'd to them the Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, and from that proves the Reſurrection of all the Faithful; but he no where hints that he had taught them this Article before, but they had rejected it. Thus he writes to the (*e*) *Theſſalonians: We would not, Brethren, that you ſhoud be ignorant concerning*

(*y*) *In this* 6 Ch. S. 7. & 13. (*z*) P. 390. (*a*) Acts 2. 10, 13. (*b*) Acts 17. 31, 32. (*c*) Acts 4. 33. (*d*) 1 Cor. 15. 12. (*e*) 1 Theſſ. 4. 13.

thoſe

those that sleep, lest you should be troubled, as others, who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus is dead and risen again, so also those that sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him. This he speaks as tho they had hitherto been ignorant of it, so that it became necessary to give them this Corollary from the Resurrection of Jesus, which they had before heard. The words of St. *Luke* also concerning the Preaching of St. *Paul* to the *Thessalonians*, are worthy Observation: (*f*) *He discoursed to them out of the Scripture three Sabbath-days, opening and alledging that Christ was to suffer, and to rise from the Dead, and that this is Christ Jesus, whom I preach unto you.* Here is mention of the Resurrection of Christ, but not of that of all the Faithful: St. *Paul* then doth not seem to have given the Catechumens the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead soon after their Entrance to Christianity among the first Rudiments of it: But yet I assure myself, he gave it them as an Appendix to the other Articles, as soon as he found it opposed and disputed. Hence, I suppose, the Apostle (*g*) mentions *the Resurrection of the Dead*, and *the eternal Judgment*, among the Fundamentals of Christianity, but yet puts them in the last place, distinct from Faith in God, and the Doctrine of Baptisms. I conclude also, that the Article concerning eternal Life was then added (at least in some Churches) after that concerning the Resurrection of the Dead, because St. *Paul* here joins the eternal Judgment with the Resurrection of the Dead.

11. As for the Article concerning the Church, I think it was added and inserted last of all, not only because (*h*) *Cyprian* gives it us in the *Novatian* Creed in the last place, and it is so read in the Confession of *Arius* and *Eunomius*; but because there is no mention of it in the Catechetical Discourses, and Epistles of the Apostles: so that this Article seems to have been added about the end of the first, or beginning of the

(*f*) Acts 17. 2, 3. (*g*) Heb. 6. 2. (*h*) *Above cited.*

second Century, against the Hereticks and Schismaticks, after they began to have separate Meetings from the Orthodox. For in the Times of *Tertullian*, the Faithful did profess the Holy Church in their Creed, as is plain from his first Piece concerning Baptism: *But when an Attestation of Faith, and a Security of Salvation, are pledg'd under three, there must be mention of the Church; for where three*, i.e. *Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are, there is the Church, which is a Body of three* (*i*). There needs no words concerning *the Communion of Saints*; for it is plain there was no mention of it in the Creed before the fourth Century.

12. There is one Article more, which I omitted on purpose, concerning the *Descent of Christ into Hell*. The above cited Author of the History, *&c.* has given us the genuine Sense of it so learnedly, that more could not have been expected from the most accomplish'd Divine. Near the end of his long *Dissertation*, he gives his Opinion that this Article was inserted against the *Arians* and *Apollinarians*, who deny'd the Soul or Spirit of Christ, and against whom the Holy Fathers argu'd thus: Christ descended into Hell either by his Divinity, his Soul, or his Body; but it is absurd to ascribe this Descent either to his Divinity, or his Body: Therefore we must conclude that he descended by his Soul, and consequently that he had a Soul. But it may be said against this, that Christ is not affirm'd in any Creed to have been in Hell by his Soul, but simply to have descended into Hell, or the lower Places of the Earth; and besides, that this Article is in some Creeds of the *Arians*, and in others more antient than *Apollinaris*. I therefore think it was rather added against the *Valentinians* and *Marcionites*. For they, as (*k*) *Irenæus* informs us, say, *That as soon as they are dead, they ascend above the Heavens, and the* Demiurgus, *and go to the Mother, or to*

(*i*) *Compare with this another Passage of* Tertullian *cited in this* 6 Ch. Sect. 7. (*k*) Lib. 5. Cap. 31. p. 491.

him,

him, whom they have feign'd to themselves the Father. A little after: (*l*) *They say this World of ours is Hell, and that their inward Man leaving the Body here, ascends into the superceleſtial Place.* *Tertullian* (*m*) glancing at this Notion, says: *We believe Hell to be, not a mere Void, nor some Sink of this ſublunary World, but a vaſt wide Place in the Trench and Depth of the Earth, and an abſtruſe Depth in the Bowels of it.* Therefore the Holy Fathers, to prove the Exiſtence of a lower Place under the Earth, and the Deſcent of the faithful Souls into it, fetch'd an Argument from the Deſcent of Chriſt himſelf into it; concerning which, *Irenæus* thus ſpeaks in the Place cited: *If theſe things had been ſo, as they ſay, the Lord himſelf, in whom they profeſs to believe, had not riſen again the third Day, but expiring upon the Croſs, had immediately aſcended, leaving his Body to the Earth. But now he ſtay'd three days, where the Dead were, as the Prophet ſays of him,* &c. *But the Apoſtle alſo ſays,* He aſcended; now what is that, but that he alſo deſcended into the lower Parts of the Earth? *This alſo* David *ſaid, propheſying of him,* Thou haſt deliver'd my Soul from the lower Hell. *If then the Lord obſerv'd the Manner of the Dead, that he might be the firſt-begotten from the Dead, and ſtay'd till the third Day in the lower Parts of the Earth, afterwards riſing in the Fleſh to ſhew his Diſciples even the Marks of the Nails, and ſo aſcended to the Father; how are they not aſhamed, who call this World Hell,* &c. *For whereas the Lord walked in the midſt of the Shadow of Death, where the Souls of the Dead are, afterwards roſe again, and after his Reſurrection was taken up; it is manifeſt that the Souls of his Diſciples, for whom he did theſe things, ſhall go into an inviſible Place, appointed for them by God, and ſhall ſtay there till the Reſurrection, in expectation of it; afterwards having receiv'd their Bodies, and being riſen perfectly,* i. e. *corporeally, even as the Lord roſe, they ſhall thus appear in the Preſence of God.* *Tertullian* has uſed (*n*) the ſame Argument: *We read that Chriſt*

(*l*) Ibidem. (*m*) P. 305. (*n*) *In the Place afore cited.*

was three Days dead in the Heart of the Earth, i. e. *in the inmoſt intimate and internal Receſs, cover'd by the Earth, dug within it, but yet built upon the lower Abyſſes. Now if Chriſt God, becauſe alſo Man, died according to the Scriptures, was bury'd according to the ſame, fulfilled this Condition of human Death alſo, to deſcend into Hell, and did not aſcend into thoſe Places which are higher than the Heavens, before he deſcended into the lower Parts of the Earth, there to communicate himſelf to the Patriarchs and Prophets; you muſt believe a ſubterraneous Region of Hell, and reject thoſe Dreamers, who proudly think the Souls of the Faithful above deſcending into Hell, Servants above their Maſters, who, forſooth, if in* Abraham*'s Boſom, would diſdain the Comforts of an expected Reſurrection.* The Hereſy then of the *Valentinians* and the *Marcionites*, was rather the Occaſion of this Article, than that of the *Arians* or *Apollinarians*; unleſs any Perſon has a mind to affirm, that the firſt Inſtructions of the Apoſtles themſelves gave occaſion to the Catechumens ſometimes to profeſs it in their Confeſſions of Faith. For the Chief of the Apoſtles, in his firſt Sermon at *Jeruſalem* on the Day of Pentecoſt, hath very clearly expounded this Article in theſe words: *That his Soul was not left in Hell, nor his Fleſh ſaw Corruption* (o).

13. From what has been ſaid, if duly weigh'd, I think it very plain, that all the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, except that of the Communion of Saints, (may be alſo that of the Church) and that of Chriſt's Deſcent into Hell, were profeſs'd by the firſt Chriſtians in their ſolemn Confeſſions of Faith, by the Authority, or at leaſt Approbation of the Apoſtles themſelves; and therefore that the Creed, for the Subſtance of moſt of its Articles, is rightly call'd Apoſtolical, and truly challeng'd by *Irenæus* (to mention none of the latter Fathers) as a Tradition received from the Apoſtles, and their Diſciples. Nor indeed can it well be, if at all, that ſo many Churches in

(o) Acts 2. 31.

ſuch

ſuch diſtant Parts of the World, ſhould agree in a Form of Creed, and ſo many Articles, unleſs they had received it in that Form, *&c.* from an Authority acknowledg'd by them all. The reaſon why the Creeds of ſeveral Churches differ in Words and Phraſes, is this (as (*p*) *Jerome* has obſerved) that *the Symbol of our Faith and Hope, deliver'd down from the Apoſtles, was not written with Ink and Paper, but upon the Fleſhly Tables of the Heart.* Hence it became free to every one to expreſs his own Senſe in his own Words; but yet I will not take upon me to prove that Tradition, which (*q*) *Rufinus* hath given us concerning the twelve Apoſtles: *Being about to depart from one another, they made a common Rule or Standard of their future Preaching, leſt perhaps being ſeparated, they ſhould teach thoſe they invited to Chriſtianity ſomething different: All of them therefore being together, and fill'd with the Holy Spirit, compoſed that ſhort Standard of their future Preaching, compiling into one Form every one's Sentiment; and reſolved it ſhould be deliver'd to the Believers.* Tho, for the *Subſtance*, or firſt Elements, of this Creed of the Apoſtles, drawn out in the Catechetical Diſcourſes of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, ſome ſuch thing as this might not be improbable; yet the Diviſion of the twelve Articles of the Creed among the twelve Apoſtles, which we have in a Piece among the Works of (*r*) St. *Auſtin*, and ſome ſuch other Fancies, which it would be impertinent to ſpeak of here, are of no value or conſideration.

(*p*) Ep. 61. c. 9. (*q*) Expoſit. Symbol.
(*r*) Tom. 10. Serm. 115. de Tempore.

CHAP. VII.

Of a famous Place in Juſtin's *Dialogue with* Trypho *the* Jew.

THERE is yet another Argument, by which (s) *Epiſcopius* attempts to ſupport his Aſſertion. *The ſecond Argument,* ſays he, *by which I prove my Antecedent, is this: It is clear from* Juſtin, *a very antient Author, (for he flouriſh'd in the Year of Chriſt* 150) *and a Martyr for the Chriſtian Religion, that the Chriſtian Churches of thoſe Days not only thought the Determination and Profeſſion of that peculiar Mode not neceſſary to Salvation; but alſo held Communion with thoſe that denied it, and profeſſed to believe that Jeſus Chriſt was no more than mere Man, Man of Man, and made Chriſt, or the Meſſiah, by Election. The Place of* Juſtin, *from which this is prov'd, is in his Dialogue with* Trypho *the* Jew (t), *which you may find cited in the Apology of the Remonſtrants, near the End of the Anſwer to the Cenſure, Chapter the third, and largely argu'd upon, and eſtabliſh'd in my (u) Anſwer of the Remonſtrants to the Specimen of Calumnies,* &c. *of the four Profeſſors of* Leyden; *to which, not to be guilty of Repetition, I refer you.* Thus *Epiſcopius.*

2. I will here give you the entire Place, not mangled and curtail'd, as it is cited by the Remonſtrants in their Apology. Thus *Juſtin* diſcourſes in that Paſſage: (x) *Now* Trypho, *I don't fail in my Proof that this is the Chriſt of God, tho I ſhould not be able to ſhew, both that he pre-exiſted the Son of the Creator of all things, being God, and that he was begotten Man of the Virgin; for it being notwithſtanding every way demonſtrated that he, whoſoever he is, is the Chriſt of God, tho I don't prove that he*

(s) Epiſcop. p. 340. vol. 1. par. 1. (t) Vol. 2. p. 2. p. 136.
(u) Ibid. p. 295. (x) P. 267.

pre-

pre-existed, and condescended according to the Council or Purpose of the Father, to be begotten Man of like Passions with us, being incarnate, you can only in justice say that I am mistaken; but you can't deny that he is the Christ, tho he only seems to be Man begotten of Man, and be prov'd to be made Christ by Election. For there are even some of our Sort, *my Friends, who confess him to be the Christ, and yet affirm that he is Man of Men. I am not of the same Opinion with these Men, nor are there many of my Sentiments who will say as they do; for we are not exhorted by Christ to give our selves up to human Arguments or Doctrines, but to those which were preach'd by the Holy Prophets, and taught by himself.* I have dissented from *Justin*'s Interpreter, both in some smaller Matters, and also in rendring the *Words in the Margin* (*y*), which indeed he has translated neither agreeably to the *Greek* Text, nor to good Sense. For from the Words going before, this must be *Justin's* (*z*) Sense: If I have elsewhere solidly prov'd from the Prophets, that our Jesus is that Christ of God, such an one as he was to be according to their Prophecies, whether God to be born Man of a Virgin, which is the Catholick Notion, and mine; or Man begotten of a Man and a Woman, as you, *Trypho*, and the *Jews*

(*y*) Ἀλλ' ἐκ παντὸς ἀποδεικνυμένου ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅστις οὗτος ἔσται.

(*z*) *Tho it is very clear that* Justin *is only arguing with* Trypho *upon his own Supposition, and* ad Hominem: *You think the Messiah is only to be Man, therefore tho I should not be able to prove the Pre-existence of Jesus, if I prove him to be the Messiah, it is enough against you.* Dr. Whitby *is pleas'd to bring this Passage as an Argument from* Justin, *that the proper Divinity of Christ is not to be concluded from his being the proper Son of God. But the Design of it is no such thing.* (2.) *The Sentiment, whatever the Doctor will have it, is not* Justin's, *but that of* Trypho *or the* Jews, *and some corrupt Christians; and the Doctor might have seen this himself, and inform'd his Reader of it, if he would have read the Words immediately following those, with which he ends this Citation, and not have taken it as he found it in* Epiſcopius: *I'm not of their Opinion, &c. Indeed the Doctor seems to have thought that* Justin *would do nothing for him, by interpolating his Words, to give them the only Turn they have towards his Sentiment.*

are

are of opinion) tho I can't demonstrate that he is the Son of God, and made Man of a Virgin, yet you are not therefore to deny that he is the very Christ foretold, and promised by the Prophets.

3. I'm sure there is nothing in these Words of *Justin*, from which *Episcopius*, or the Remonstrants, can prove either that the Church in *Justin*'s Time, or that *Justin* himself held the Doctrine of the Son's Divinity not necessary to Salvation, much less that they kept up Communion with those Churches that deny'd it. If indeed the Remonstrants can prove any thing from it, they prove too much, which is a certain Sign of a very bad Argument. For the Persons here noted by *Justin*, not only affirm'd that our Saviour was only Man, but Man begotten of the Coition of a Man and a Woman after the common Manner of Men. From this, if the Remonstrants argue rightly from the Place, it will follow that *Justin*, and the Church in *Justin*'s Days, held Communion with those, who, despising the Authority of the Holy Evangelists, and the constant and consentient Tradition of the Catholick and Apostolick Church, were not afraid to deny that the Man Christ was born of the Virgin *Mary*; an Opinion worthy a Mad-Man only. I have not yet indeed (*a*) seen *the Answer of the Remonstrants to the Specimen of Calumnies*, &c. so as to know certainly how they confirm their Assertion from the Place cited out of *Justin*, and therefore can only argue *conjecturally*.

4. But have they given it as their Opinion, that what they contend for, follows from this that *Justin* says, namely, that it could not be false, that Jesus was the promised Christ, tho it was not demonstrable that he was God, and born Man of the Virgin? Now it is very clear that *Justin* here uses the Argument *ad Hominem*, which is very common in these

(*a*) *Our Reverend Author afterwards got a Sight of this worthy Piece, and hath directly, and at large, confuted it in the Appendix.*

Disputes.

Diſputes. *Juſtin* had before attempted to prove that it was foretold of Chriſt by the Prophets, that he, tho exiſting before Ages, the Son of God, and God, ſhould at laſt be born Man of a Virgin. When he afterwards made a Digreſſion concerning ſome other Matters, *Trypho* calls him back to the finiſhing the former Point. (*b*) *We have heard the Sentiment of theſe things, now reſume the Diſcourſe, where you left off, and finiſh it; for it ſeems to me a Paradox, and impoſſible to be proved. That you ſhould ſay this Chriſt pre-exiſted, being God before Ages, and afterwards condeſcended to be begotten, being made Man, and that he is not Man of Man, is, I I think, not only ſtrange, but abſurd.* *Juſtin* then, as *Trypho* deſires, reſumes the Diſputation, and finiſhes it at large, fully proving that the Chriſt foretold by the Prophets was to be both God and Man, born of *a Virgin.* In the mean time, to ſtop the Mouth of his cavilling Adverſary at preſent, he gives him a twofold Anſwer. Firſt, he ſharply blames his Blindneſs and Obſtinacy, and that alſo of the *Jewiſh* Nation, who rejected the Doctrine concerning Chriſt, the Son of God, and God, who was alſo to take upon him Fleſh from a Virgin, tho plainly deliver'd in the Old Teſtament, as incredible, abſurd, and fooliſh, and choſe rather to believe their own doating *Rabbies* in this Matter, than the Voice of God by his inſpired Prophets: (*c*) *I know,* ſays he, *the Diſcourſe ſeems ſtrange, and eſpecially to thoſe of the Nation or Kindred, who are not inclined either to underſtand or perform the Things of God, but thoſe of your own Teachers; as God himſelf cries out againſt you.* It is eaſy to gueſs (by the way) to how much greater Blindneſs *Juſtin* would have thought thoſe Men abandon'd and condemn'd, who, profeſſing themſelves Chriſtians, and living in the cleareſt Light of the Goſpel, (to which the old Prophecy, comparatively ſpeaking, was only as a Light ſhining in a dark Place) have with equal Pertinacy

(*b*) P. 267. (*c*) Ibidem.

rejected

rejected that Doctrine. Surely now, if *Episcopius* and the Remonstrants had attentively read these words of *Justin* immediately going before those cited by them, they could never have thought the Place for their purpose. But to proceed.

5. After this, *Justin* answers, by refuting *Trypho*, from Principles own'd by him, in the Place cited by the Remonstrants: *But, O* Trypho, *I don't fail in my Proof that this is the Christ of God*, &c. As tho he should have said: If I could not prove from the Prophets, (which I have partly done already, and shall do hereafter more fully and effectually) that the Christ was to be God, and Man born of a Virgin for our Salvation; I should not therefore quite lose my Cause, at least with you *Jews*, who cannot, agreeably to your Principles, deny that our Jesus is that Christ; for you expect no other Christ, or Messiah foretold and promised by the Prophets, than one that is mere Man, begotten of Men. This *Trypho* himself quickly confesses: (*d*) *We all*, says he, *look for Christ as Man begotten of Man.* It is then plain, that *Justin* here argues, not from his own Sentiment, or the Truth of the Thing itself, but from the Hypothesis of the *Jews*, with whom he disputes. For *Justin* indeed could not, without the grossest Contradiction, and a manifest Refutation of a great part of what he has eagerly contended for in this Dialogue, affirm, or allow that it did not really follow that Jesus was not that Christ of God foretold by the Prophets, if he was not true God, born Man of a Virgin. There he lays himself out greatly, in proving that it was very plainly foretold of that Christ of God by the Prophets, that he should be absolutely God, and should take Flesh from a Virgin. Besides, *Justin* elsewhere expressly teaches, that no one could be equal to the Office of Christ the Mediator, unless he was the very Son of God, and consequently God. There is a remarkable Passage in the Epistle to *Diognetus*:

(*d*) P. 268.

He

(*e*) *He gave his own Son a Ranſom for us, the Holy for the Sinners, the Innocent for the Evil, the Juſt for the Unjuſt, the Incorruptible for the Corruptible, the Immortal for the Mortal.* For what elſe could cover our Sins but his Righteouſneſs? By whom *was it poſſible for us Sinners and Impious to be juſtify'd, but by the only Son of God. O the ſweet Redemption, O the unſearchable Work!* Therefore, according to *Juſtin*, it could not be that any ſhould ſatisfy God the Father for our Sins (the chief Office of our Saviour Chriſt) beſides the proper, incorruptible, immortal Son of God. Now who this Son of God is, ſo celebrated by *Juſtin*, every one who is the leaſt acquainted with the Holy Martyr's Works, well knows; namely, that Son of God, who was begotten of God the Father before every Creature, who was his Counſellor and Aſſiſtant in the Creation of all things; who laſtly, at the appointed time, deſcended from Heaven, being made Man, for Man's Salvation. Parallel to this, is what we have in this (*f*) *ſame Dialogue*, where firſt having given a clear account of the Catholick Doctrine, both of the univerſal Guilt of Mankind, from that celebrated Place, *Curſed is every one, who hath not continued in thoſe things, which are written in the Book of the Law, to do them*; and of the Satisfaction made by Jeſus Chriſt crucify'd, who took upon him the Curſe of all Men; he immediately adds, that what the *Jews* were entirely ignorant of, was foretold by God, that *this Jeſus is before all things, and the eternal Prieſt of God, and King, and was to be the Chriſt.* By theſe words he ſignifies God's Intention and Decree, that the Sins of Men ſhould not be expiated but by an eternal Prieſt, who exiſted before (*g*) *all things.* Compare alſo what he ſays in this *Dialogue*

(*e*) P. 500. (*f*) P. 323.

(*g*) —*That Mankind could not be freed from the Corruption contracted by the Fall of* Adam, *but by the Incarnation of him, who was in his own Nature Life, that is God, or the Eſſential Son of God,* Juſtin *hath expreſly taught in a loſt Oration of his againſt the* Gentiles;

Dialogue (h) from the 110th Pſalm concerning Chriſt, a Prieſt according to the Order of *Melchizedeck*. Nor was this a Singularity of *Juſtin's*, but the common Sentiment of the Primitive Fathers, who have all with one Conſent taught, that it is abſolutely neceſſary the Saviour and Mediator of Men with God, ſhould be God and Man; a Point, if it was not foreign to my Purpoſe, which I could prove by a great many Evidences. However, at preſent I'll produce two Evidences of Catholick Doctrine for all, but thoſe very ample, one more antient than *Juſtin*, and the other juſt after him. *Ignatius*, a Biſhop of the Apoſtolick Age, teaches this plain in a *Place* I have often cited from him: *There is one Phyſician, carnal and ſpiritual, made and unmade, God in the Fleſh, true Life in Death*, &c. He thought it was God-Man alone who could give a ſaving Medicine to our Souls, grievouſly diſtemper'd, and mortally ſick. But (*i*) *Irenæus*, next to *Juſtin*, frequently urges and inculcates the ſame Doctrine, and eſpecially where he explains it in a *Learned Manner*, thus: *He then united Man to God. For if Man had not conquer'd the Adverſary of Man, he had not been lawfully conquer'd. Again, if God had not given Salvation, we could not have firmly obtain'd it; and if Man had not been united to God, he could not have been Partaker of Incorruption. For it behoved the Mediator of God*

tiles; *from which* Leontius, *in his ſecond Book againſt the* Eutychians *and* Neſtorians, *hath cited theſe words:* Corruption being become natural to us, it was neceſſary that he, who would ſave us, ſhould deſtroy that which corrupted us. This could not otherwiſe be, except what was naturally Life was join'd to that which was corruptible, to vanquiſh Corruption, and for the future preſerve that Immortal which was obnoxious to it. It was therefore neceſſary that the Word ſhould be embody'd, to free us from the Death of our natural Corruption. *Grabe. See the Spicileg. Tom.* 1. *Cent.* 2. *p.* 172. *where you have this entire Fragment tranſcribed in* Greek, *from a MS. in the* Bodleian, *and in p.* 173. *the parallel Place of* Irenæus, *here cited by the Right Reverend Author.*

(*h*) P. 250, &c. (*i*) P. 284. Lib. 3. Cap. 20.

and

and Men, by a proper Familiarity with both, to bring them to Friendſhip and Unanimity, to preſent Man to God, and to make known God to Men. Neither *Juſtin* therefore, nor any Catholick of that Age, could ſafely grant, that it did not follow that Jeſus was not the Chriſt, upon ſuppoſition that he was mere Man only. For from this Hypotheſis (which was *Juſtin*'s, and Catholick) *Whoſoever is Chriſt, muſt be God*; it neceſſarily follows, that they who deny Jeſus to be God, deny him to be Chriſt. We muſt then conclude, that *Juſtin* in the Place controverted, argued from the Hypotheſis of the *Jews*, with whom he had to do, and who believed that Chriſt was to be a mere Man only.

6. But beſides this, it may be objected that *Juſtin* ſpeaks plainly of ſome, who in his days confeſs'd Jeſus to be the Chriſt, and yet both deny'd his Divinity, and that he was born of a Virgin, as tho they were in the Communion of the Catholick Church, and eſteem'd true Chriſtians: for he ſays that they were of one Sort, *i. e.* of the Chriſtian Kind. But this is nothing. For thoſe Opiniators might be call'd by *Juſtin*, of ours, *i. e.* of the Chriſtians, as receiving the Chriſt, and upon that account boaſting themſelves to be Chriſtians, as (*k*) *Origen* ſpeaks of the *Ebionites*, whom we ſhall alſo find hereafter to be intended in this Place by *Juſtin*. The ſame (*l*) *Origen* alſo, treating of ſome other notorious Hereticks, calls them ſome in the Multitude of Believers, *i. e.* of thoſe that profeſs'd Chriſt. So alſo (*m*) *Juſtin*, in his ſecond Apology to *Antoninus Pius*, having firſt ſpoke of the Diſciples of *Simon*, *Menander*, and *Marcion* (the worſt of Hereticks) adds: *All that ſprung from theſe, are call'd Chriſtians, as thoſe, who, tho not of the ſame Sentiments, entirely bear the common Name given to Philoſophers.* Indeed, if *Juſtin* had here diſputed with ſome Sect of Chriſtians that diſſented from him, and had call'd

(*k*) Lib. 5. contra Celſum, p. 272.
(*l*) Lib. 8. p. 387. (*m*) P. 70.

them,

them, by way of Contradiſtinction, *of our Sort*, whoſe Sentiment he deſcribes concerning Chriſt as mere Man, it might have been probably concluded, that he held them for Men of the ſame Communion, and conſequently for true Members of the Catholick Church. But the Caſe is far otherwiſe. For in this place, *Juſtin* diſputes with *Trypho*, and his Friends the *Jews*, profeſs'd Enemies of Chriſtianity, from whom Men of every Sect, under the common Name of Chriſtians, might be juſtly diſtinguiſh'd. Moreover, where *Juſtin* ſpeaks of Chriſtians diſſenting from him in any Point, but yet in the Communion of the Church, and holding the Catholick Faith, he clearly ſignifies it. Thus in this (*n*) *very Dialogue*, ſpeaking of the Catholick Chriſtians who rejected the *Millennium*, which he embraced, he ſays they were Chriſtians in other reſpects of pure and pious Principles. If *Juſtin* had given ſuch a Character of theſe Men, who deny'd the Divinity of our Lord Chriſt, the Remonſtrants might have had ſomething to have rejoiced at in the Communion, which *Juſtin*, and the Church in his time, held with them. But in vain do they attempt to prove this, becauſe *Juſtin* call'd thoſe Hereticks [*of our Sort.*] Now what if theſe ſhould not be *Juſtin*'s Words? Indeed I am verily perſuaded there is an Error here, and one that may be eaſily corrected only by the Change of a Letter, *i. e.* by writing ὑμετέρε inſtead of ἡμετέρε. which if admitted, the Words muſt be render'd *of your Sort*, that is, of the *Jewiſh* Nation. An Error which has happen'd in this ſame Period, the writing πιῶτον for τῶτον, ſhews how eaſily this we are now obſerving might be. But my Reaſons for this Correction are plainly theſe: (1.) Whereſoever in this Dialogue this Form of Speaking occurs [ὅτι ἀπὸ γένες] the word γένος is taken not metaphorically, but properly for a Nation or Kindred; ſo that [ὅτι ἀπὸ γένες πιῶν] may be ſaid to be Perſons of a certain Nation

(*n*) P. 306.

or

or Kindred. So in the Sentence before the *Paſſage* cited, and in the *preceding Page*, and every where. Now in this ſenſe, *Juſtin* could not, by that Expreſſion, mean the Profeſſors of the Chriſtian Religion, for Chriſtians were not all of one Nation, *&c.* Upon this account, I don't remember that you can find any Place where Chriſtians univerſally are by *Juſtin* call'd our Nation. (2.) The Heterodox, *Juſtin* ſpeaks of, were *Ebionites*, as we ſhall prove by and by; now they were indeed of the *Jewiſh* Nation: Hence the Antient Eccleſiaſtical Writers uſually range the Hereſy of the *Ebionites* among thoſe, which roſe amongſt the *Jews*. See the (*o*) *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, and what we have ſaid *before* (*p*). (3.) In the Paſſage of the preceding Page, refer'd to before, *Juſtin* manifeſtly treating of the *Ebionites*, writes thus: *If thoſe of the Nation, who profeſs to believe in this Chriſt*, Trypho, *compel thoſe of the* Gentiles, *who believe in this Chriſt, to live exactly according to the Law of* Moſes, *or elſe deny to communicate with them in ſuch a way*, (namely, that he had ſpoke of a little before, of having all things in common as Brethren, and Men of the ſame Bowels) *I ſhould alſo refuſe them.* Thoſe Chriſtians of the *Jews*, who not only obſerv'd the Ritual Law of *Moſes* themſelves, but alſo impos'd upon the *Gentile* Chriſtians a Neceſſity of doing the ſame, were certainly the *Ebionites*, and no others. Add to theſe the Teſtimony of (*q*) *Epiphanius*, that the *Ebionites* taught Circumciſion as inſtituted by God, and commanded to all for the ſake of Purity, and obtaining the Inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven. Now ſince the *Ebionites* are here deſcrib'd by this Periphraſis, [*thoſe of your Nation who profeſs to believe in this Chriſt*] who can doubt but in the Place cited by the Remonſtrants, *Juſtin*, ſpeaking of the ſame *Ebionites*, in like manner calls them [*ſome of your Nation, who confeſs that he is Chriſt?*] (4.) Laſtly, if this Reading is receiv'd, *Juſtin* will be conſiſtent, other-

(*o*) C. 6. Lib. 6. (*p*) Ch. 3. Sect. 1, 3. (*q*) Hæreſ. 30. C. 30.

wiſe not. He had ſaid, as we have obſerv'd, that tho he could not prove, that our Jeſus was both God before Ages, and in the Fulneſs of Time made Man of a Virgin; yet that *Trypho*, who was a *Jew*, ought not therefore to deny that he was the Chriſt, or Meſſiah promiſed by the Prophets. This he proves very fitly, and illuſtrates by the Example of ſome of the *Jewiſh* Nation, who neither acknowledg'd the Divinity of Jeſus, nor his Nativity of a Virgin, and yet confeſs'd him to be Chriſt. The Caſe is indeed clear to me, and if I am not greatly miſtaken, the impartial Reader, who weighs the Scope and Context of the Place with Diligence and Judgment, will be of my Opinion.

7. But perhaps ſome Perſon will urge, that *Juſtin* ſimply profeſſes his own Diſſent from the Heterodox he glances at, without any other Brand of Infamy upon them. He only ſays, he is not of their mind, and neither calls their Opinion Hereſy, nor them Hereticks. I anſwer, What if it be ſo? He has no buſineſs with them in that place. He is upon another Deſign, and only mentions them by the by. But is it abſolutely neceſſary, that he who thinks another an Heretick, ſhould call him ſo, as often as he ſpeaks of him? I doubt not but that *Juſtin*, in the Book profeſſedly wrote by him againſt all Hereſies (which he alſo mentions in this Dialogue) has ſharply treated this, and painted it in proper Colours. Beſides, here is a plain Miſtake, that *Juſtin* has not ſtigmatized theſe vain Thinkers. For he plainly ſays, that they did not only diſſent from him, but from the Faith and Opinion of moſt Chriſtians, *i. e.* the Catholick Church. And indeed in *Juſtin*'s time, thoſe who taught that our Lord was only Man begotten of Man, were either *Carpocratians*, or *Cerinthians*, or laſtly, *Ebionites*, who all in one Body were a very few, compar'd with the other Chriſtians, and were all of them ſeparated from the Communion of the Apoſtolical Churches. No one doubts it of the *Carpocratians* and *Cerinthians*.

As

As for the *Ebionites*, it is clear from what we have cited out of *Ignatius* and *Irenæus*, that they, from their firſt Original, were accounted Hereticks by the Catholick Church. Moſt of the Chriſtians of the Circumciſion, that is, the *Nazaræans*, who retain'd the Primitive Faith of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, founded by the Apoſtles, *condemn'd their* Opinion of Chriſt as mere Man (*r*); and they, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter, neither were, nor could be in Communion with the Church of the *Gentile* Chriſtians. Further, *Juſtin* ſignifies that they of whom he ſpeaks, did not only go contrary to Catholick Conſent, but alſo oppos'd the Sacred Oracles of the Old, and eſpecially the New Teſtament. This he plainly hints in the laſt words of the cited Paragraph, which the Remonſtrants, with more Cunning than Candour, have omitted. *I*, ſays he, *am not of their mind, nor moſt Chriſtians; for we are exhorted by Chriſt to believe, not the Traditions and Doctrines of Men, but thoſe which the Holy Prophets have publiſh'd, and Chriſt himſelf hath taught.* Nay, *Juſtin* clearly hints in theſe words (as ſhall be prov'd hereafter) that thoſe Heterodox Men rather gave credit to human Traditions, than the Predictions of the old Prophets, or the Words of Chriſt himſelf in his Goſpel. This ſurely was enough for *Juſtin* to ſay of them by the way.

8. What I have often mention'd, that the *Ebionites* are here cenſur'd by *Juſtin*, I come now to explain and confirm at large. Now if we conſult Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and the antient Hereſiologers, we ſhall find that there is no Sect of Chriſtians, either in *Juſtin*'s time or before, with which the Opinion here deſcrib'd does exactly agree, except the *Ebionites*. For tho the *Carpocratians* and *Cerinthians*, as well as the *Ebionites*, did affirm Jeſus to have been only a mere Man, propagated of both Sexes; yet it never was their Opinion, that he was by Election promoted to

(*r*) *See* Ch. 2. *of this Treatiſe*, Sect. 11, 12.

the Office of Mediator. Nay, I know not whether they had any Thoughts of the Chriſt or Meſſiah foretold by the Prophets. The *Carpocratians*, as (*s*) *Irenæus* reports, placed the Dignity and Excellence of our Jeſus in this, *That his Soul being firm and pure, he remember'd thoſe things which he had ſeen, when he was carry'd about in the unbegotten God, and that therefore God gave him power to vanquiſh the Makers of the World, and having paſs'd thro all, and deliver'd all, to aſcend to God.* This Whim never enter'd into the Head of thoſe whom *Juſtin* cenſures. Beſides, thoſe *Carpocratians* were the worſt of Men, given to Magick; and arriv'd at ſuch a pitch of Impiety, as to deny all Diſtinction of Good and Evil, as *Irenæus* in the ſame place informs us. We can't therefore believe that *Juſtin* would build any Argument againſt *Trypho*, and his Friends the *Jews*, upon the Opinion of theſe Men, or rather Brutes in human Shape; eſpecially when the *Jews*, in other reſpects, whether of their Country, or the Sacred Rites, had nothing in common with them. As for the *Cerinthians* alſo, tho they indeed ſymboliz'd with the *Jews*, to avoid the Perſecutions rais'd by them; yet the Opinion deſcrib'd and cenſur'd by *Juſtin*, does not quadrate with them. For the *Cerinthians* did not confeſs Jeſus to be the Chriſt, but underſtood the word *Chriſt*, not as denoting Office or Honour, but as ſignifying a certain *Æon*, or Power, which deſcended from the Chief of all Powers to Jeſus for a time only, as we have often obſerv'd before. It remains then that *Juſtin* be thought to intend the *Ebionites*. For beſides theſe three Sects, there is no other mention'd by any Eccleſiaſtical Writer, which either in the Days of *Juſtin*, or before, taught that Jeſus was only a Man begotten of Men. Almoſt all the other Hereticks of thoſe Times, who were Heterodox concerning the Perſon of Chriſt, have ſpoke againſt the Truth and Reality of his human Nature. Now the

(*s*) Lib. 1. Cap. 24. p. 121, & 122.

Ebionites

Ebionites being *Jews*, when they went off from the Primitive Faith and Opinion of the Church of *Jeruſalem*, embrac'd the common Notion of the *Jews* concerning the Meſſiah, which was the very ſame *Juſtin* deſcribes in the Place cited. Hereupon *Trypho* ſoon after commends and approves it: *I think thoſe who ſay he was made Man, and by Election anointed and made the Chriſt, ſpeak more probably than thoſe, who ſay as you ſay. For all we expect, that Chriſt will be made Man of Man, and that* Elias *will come and anoint him.* And afterwards he (*t*) adviſes *Juſtin*, if he would perſuade the *Jews* and others that Jeſus is the Chriſt, to teach that he was Man of Man, and for his ſtrict and perfect way of Life, was thought worthy to be choſen the Meſſiah (*u*). This indeed was the very Opinion of *Ebion*, and his firſt Diſciples, tho the later *Ebionites* went off from it, and took up ſeveral Opinions concerning Chriſt, many of them embracing ſomething not unlike *Cerinthianiſm*, as (*x*) *Epiphanius* ſays.

9. But to return to the controverted Place of *Juſtin*. The laſt Words of it, in which *Juſtin* hints that the Heterodox cenſur'd by him did attend more to human Doctrines than the Sayings of the Prophets, and of Chriſt himſelf in the Goſpel, clearly point out the *Ebionites*. For they were ſo wedded to the Scheme they had receiv'd from the *Hebrew* Doctors concerning Chriſt's mere Humanity, that they would not ſuffer themſelves to be divorc'd, tho the Predictions of the Prophets, and the Teſtimonies of the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles of Chriſt, oppos'd it. They ſhut their Eyes, and ſtopt their Ears againſt the Predictions of the Prophets, which expreſly declare the Divine Glory and Majeſty of the Meſſiah. They, as well as the *Jews*, deprav'd the Prophetical Oracle concerning the Virgin

(*t*) P. 291.

(*u*) *Very remarkable that in* Juſtin's *Days, and ſome pretended Chriſtian Prieſts in our Times, ſhould agree in facilitating the Converſion of Mankind, by denying the Divinity of Chriſt.*

(*x*) Hæreſ. 30. C. 3. collat. C. 14.

Birth, by an insipid Comment. And, for the Scriptures of the New Testament, they only received the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, rejecting the other three, especially that of St. *John*, because he, both in the beginning of his Gospel, plainly and professedly declares the eternal Divinity of our Lord, and very often elsewhere reports how he asserted his Divine Majesty before the *Jews*. Nay, they mutilated the very Gospel of St. *Matthew*; for they took away the first Chapter, and begun with those things which happen'd in the Times of *Herod* and *Caiaphas* the High Priest, for this reason, because that Chapter contain'd a clear Testimony concerning Christ's Nativity of the Virgin. They were not afraid openly to reject whatsoever in the Scriptures of the New Testament contradicted their *Rabbinical* Notions. Perhaps *Ignatius* had an eye upon the Impudence and Wickedness of these Men in his (*y*) Epistle to the *Philadelphians* (in which, no doubt, he plainly censures the Hereticks, who then attempted to bring *Judaism* into the Churches of the *Gentiles*:) *I have heard some, who say, Unless I find it in the Antients, I don't believe it in the Gospel*; *and when I have said to them*, It is written, *they have reply'd*, It is nothing worth, tho written, or it is establish'd before [*in the Antients.*] The Antients, I suppose, are the old Rabbins, Masters, or Doctors of the *Hebrews*, who were famous some Years before our Lord's Coming, whose Doctrines and Traditions the *Jews* and their mad Admirers esteem'd as Oracles. The word προκειται is unintelligibly render'd by the old Interpreter [*præjacet.*] It often signifies to be thrown away, as of no value or worth. If so, *Ignatius*'s Sense must be, That these Men, of whom he speaks, were not ashamed to profess, that they would only so far believe the Gospel, as it was agreeable to the Traditions of these Doctors; and that when he refuted the Opinions they had receiv'd from them, by the Scriptures of the New Te-

(*y*) Vol. 2. P. A. p. 33.

stament

ſtament receiv'd in the Church, they reply'd that they rejected thoſe Scriptures, as of no Authority. Thus the pretended *Ignatius* ſeems to have underſtood the Word, when he thus enlarges upon the Place: (z) *It is hard to kick againſt the Pricks, it is hard to disbelieve Chriſt, it is hard to reject the Preaching of the Apoſtles.* But the Word may alſo be referred to the Opinion theſe Hereticks defended againſt the Scriptures, alledg'd by *Ignatius* in another and a contrary Signification: For as the ſimple Verb κεῖται ſometimes ſignifies, *It is laid down*, it is an Axiom, upon which account ſuch Propoſitions are call'd κείμενα; ſo προκεῖται may ſignify, *It is laid down, fix'd, defin'd, or eſtabliſh'd before.* If ſo, the Senſe will be, That the Hereticks reply'd to *Ignatius*, diſputing with them out of the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, that their Opinion was defin'd and eſtabliſh'd before, namely, by the Antients, when the Scriptures were not as yet publiſh'd. Take it which way you pleaſe, you may plainly ſee the ſame fooliſh Veneration of the Antients, the ſame profane Contempt of the Scriptures. But this, by the way; I proceed. Theſe *Ebionites* alſo, in order to defend the univerſal Obligation of the Ritual *Moſaical* Law, rejected all St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles, and call'd him an Apoſtate from the Law. Well then, were not theſe Men Hereticks, and did not *Juſtin* eſteem them ſo? Did the Church in *Juſtin*'s Time, or did *Juſtin* himſelf hold Communion with them? He may believe it that can, but I can't. Nay more, *Juſtin* could not communicate with the *Ebionites*, if he would, for they would not communicate with the *Gentile* Chriſtians, and were therefore rejected as Hereticks by *Juſtin*, as is plain from a Paſſage we have *before cited* from him, in this Chapter.

10. I ſuppoſe I have now ſufficiently prov'd that the Paſſage in *Juſtin*, cited by *Epiſcopius* and the Remonſtrants, was in vain alledg'd by them to prove, that the Church in *Juſtin*'s time held Communion with thoſe that deny'd the Divinity of our Lord Jeſus.

(z) Ibid. p. 84.

For from what has been ſaid, it is very evident, that thoſe Opiniators noted by *Juſtin* in that place, both deny'd the Divinity of Chriſt, and alſo his Nativity of the Virgin; and that they might defend their Hypotheſis, held it neceſſary to reject, and conſequently did impiouſly and impudently reject the Sacred Goſpels of Chriſt receiv'd by the Catholick Church, and daily read in their Sacred Aſſemblies; that is, that the *Ebionites* were certainly intended by *Juſtin*, who were caſt off by the other Chriſtians of the Circumciſion, namely the *Nazaræans*, and who neither could, nor would communicate with any Church of the *Gentiles*.

11. To what has been ſaid, I will only add ſome Places out of this very Dialogue with *Trypho*, by which it will plainly appear, what *Juſtin* himſelf thought of the Neceſſity of believing the Articles of our Saviour's Divinity, and of thoſe *Ebionites* and others who deny'd it. Firſt then, let us conſult (*a*) *the Place*, I have often cited upon another Occaſion; where he ſays, that their Faith concerning Chriſt, who are ſav'd under the Goſpel, is ſuch, as *acknowledges Chriſt to be the Son of God, who was before* Lucifer *and the Moon, and who being made Fleſh, condeſcended to be born of the Virgin of the Houſe of* David, *that by this Diſpenſation the Serpent, who was firſt an Evil-doer, and the Angels who are like to him, might be deſtroy'd*, &c. From this we may eaſily conclude, that *Juſtin* did not eſteem their Faith, who believ'd in ſuch a Chriſt, or Son of God, as did not exiſt before *Mary*, and who was not begotten of the Virgin *Mary*, but of *Joſeph* and *Mary*, to be the Chriſtian Faith, or ſuch a Faith concerning the Perſon of Chriſt, as is ſufficient to Salvation. Surely every Man, who reads the entire Place, muſt think that *Juſtin* has there given us the Symbol or Rule of Faith, ſo far as it relates to Chriſt, and what he undertook, which in his time was re-

(*a*) P. 264.

ceived

ceived in the Church, and consequently that those, who contradicted it, could not but be esteem'd by the Church, and of course by him, who constantly adhered to it, as Apostates from the Rule, *i. e.* Hereticks. This will be more clear yet from another Passage in the same *(b) Dialogue*, where he seems to give us, as it were, a short Account of that Piece he had compos'd against all Heresies: *There are then*, says he, *and have been many Proselytes to Christianity, who have taught atheistical and blasphemous Tenets and Practices. We have given them their Denomination from those, from whom every Doctrine and Opinion sprung. Some of them teach one way, and others another of blaspheming the Maker of the Universe, and Christ, whom he had foretold should come, even the God of* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob. *We communicate with none of these, as knowing themselves to be atheistical, impious, unjust and irregular, and instead of Worshippers of Jesus, only nominal Confessors of him. They call themselves Christians indeed, as the Heathen give the Name of God to things made with hands, and communicate in unlawful and impious Mysteries. Some of them are call'd* Marcionites, *some* Valentinians, *some* Basilidians, *some* Saturnilians, *and others by other Names, every one being denominated from the Author of his Opinion.* Here *Justin* manifestly treats of all the Hereticks which in his Age or before had disturb'd the Church; he only names some of them, and adds that there were others known by other Names taken from their respective Heresiarchs, *viz. Carpocratians* from *Carpocrates*, *Cerinthians* from *Cerinthus*, *Ebionites* from *Ebion*, and many others. All these Hereticks did in some sort blaspheme God the Father, or the Son, or both, by their Doctrine. *Some*, says he, *teach one way, others another, of blaspheming the Maker of the Universe, and Christ, whom he had foretold should come, even the God of* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob. Here it is especially to be observ'd, that this Christ and the God of *Abraham*,

(*b*) P. 253.

Isaac,

Isaac, and *Jacob*, are spoken of as the same Person, namely, as he whom the Maker of the Universe foretold should come, that is, the Son of God. For first, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, is plainly distinguish'd from the Maker of the Universe, that is, from God the Father. Then it is notorious, that *Justin* every where in this Dialogue teaches, that it was Christ, or the Son of God, who appear'd to *Moses* in the burning Bush, and call'd himself the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*. Well then, did not the *Ebionites* blaspheme Christ, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, at all, who openly deny'd that Christ was the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*? who taught that he did not exist before *Abraham*, no not before *Mary*; who presumed to affirm that he was no more than a meer Man begotten of *Joseph* and *Mary*? Further, *Justin* says, that these Hereticks were, instead of Worshippers of Jesus, *only nominal Confessors of him*. Don't these words also strike at the *Ebionites*? Sure they do. For of what Worship or Adoration doth *Justin* speak? Of that, doubtless, which he, in this Dialogue, contends is due to Jesus Christ, and in which he enlarges himself upon the Proof, that he is both adorable and God, that is, to be adored as God. Without doubt he speaks of the Worship, which all Catholick Christians then gave to Christ, who glorify'd and adored him as God, together with the Father and Holy Spirit, in Hymns and Doxologies, as he (*c*) *himself* informs us (*d*). Did the *Ebionites* give such Worship to Christ? Nay, could they give it? By no means. Therefore it is certain that *Justin* placed the *Ebionites*, and all others, who, as well as they, oppos'd our Saviour's Divinity, in the Catalogue of Hereticks, with which the Church had no Communion, and whom they rejected as impious, and utterly unworthy the Name of Christians.

(*c*) P. 56. (*d*) *See what we have said upon this Place in the* Defence of the Nicene Creed, Sect. 2. Ch. 4. S. 8.

12. To

12. To these, if you please, you may add a third Place in this same Dialogue. There *Justin*, at the Instigation of *Trypho*, attempts largely to prove, that in the Old Testament he is frequently call'd God, and true God, not God improperly speaking, who is yet personally distinct from God the Parent of the Universe, meaning this Jesus Christ, in whom we believe: and further undertakes to bring such Arguments for it from the Law and the Prophets, as no Man shall be able to contradict. Then he immediately adds concerning the Proofs he was about to produce: (*e*) *They will seem strange to you, tho daily read by you. From this you may know, that God has hid the Power of understanding the Wisdom of his Words from you; except such, to whom, as* Isaiah *speaks, according to his very great Compassion, he has left as a Seed to Salvation, that your Nation might not utterly perish, like those of* Sodom *and* Gomorrah. Here every one may plainly see that the *Jews*, who believ'd in Christ, and embrac'd his Doctrine, are understood as those, who alone of the *Jewish* Nation are left by God as a Seed unto Salvation. But *Justin* plainly enough signifies, that all these understood the Wisdom, or Mystery of Christ the Son of God, and consequently God, to be deliver'd in the Old Scriptures; therefore he by no means thought, that they of the *Jewish* Nation, who professing to believe in Christ, did not yet perceive that Wisdom either in the Writings of the Prophets, or in the clear Light of the Gospel, namely the *Ebionites*, did belong to the Seed reserv'd by God to Salvation, that is, were truly Believers, or Christians; but rather judg'd them to be of the same Class with the *Jews*, who were reprobate, and blinded by the just Judgment of God. What I have before discoursed of the old *Nazaræans* (*f*), or the *Hierosolymitan* Christians of the Circumcision, is very proper to be consulted here, as what will both give light to this Place, and be better understood by it.

(*e*) P. 274. (*f*) Ch. 2. §. 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

APPEN-

APPENDIX to the Seventh Chapter.

AFTER I had finish'd my former Observations upon the celebrated Passage of *Justin*, I procur'd the other Volume of *Episcopius*'s Works, in which I found the second Edition of the *Answer to the Specimen of Calumnies*, &c.

Now in that Answer the Remonstrants use many (*g*) Arguments to prove from that Place, that the *Antient Primitive Christian Church* held Communion with those who believ'd and profess'd that Christ Jesus was mere Man only, Man of Man, and made Christ by Election. They boast of some of their Arguments as the cleerest imaginable, and propose others as highly probable. As for the first sort, every unprejudiced Man may see from what I have said before, that they are so far from being the most clear imaginable, that they can't justly be call'd highly probable. Nevertheless, we will briefly examine these very clear Arguments of *Episcopius* and the Remonstrants.

2. (1.) *Justin*, says *Episcopius*, *affirms it possible to demonstrate solidly, that Jesus is the Christ of God, the promised Messiah, tho he can't prove that Christ pre-existed as the Son of God. He therefore believ'd that he might, by a sure Faith, be taken for, and worshipped as the Messiah, tho he was deny'd to be the eternal Son of God.* I refer my Reader to a full and clear Answer to this in the *foregoing Chapter* (*h*). The Ground of *Episcopius*'s Error, and that of the Remonstrants, was their not observing that *Justin* in this Place we are speaking of, does not argue from his own Sentiment, or the Truth of the Thing itself, but from the *Jewish* Hypothesis, with whom he disputes. Nothing can be plainer. (2.)

(*g*) Vol. 2. p. 2. Op. Episcop. p. 295, & 296.
(*h*) Ch. 7. Sect. 4, 5.

Justin,

Justin, Episcopius adds, *affirms, that, if any one believes Christ to be only Man begotten of Man, and made Christ by Election, he only errs, but does not deny the Christ. He therefore believed this Error to be such an one, as was consistent with that Faith, by which we believe Christ to be the Messiah, in which he places the Essence of Christianity.* Now the Antecedent is plainly false. For *Justin* no where affirms what *Episcopius* says he doth. The words of *Justin*, in which *Episcopius* fancy'd his Antecedent, are these: *But if I should not demonstrate that he* [our Jesus] *did pre-exist, and condescended to be made Man of like Passions with us, and incarnate according to the purpose of the Father, you may justly say I'm mistaken in that Point, but you can't deny that he is the Christ. Mistaken in what? In affirming his Pre-existence and Nativity of the Virgin. But then You,* Trypho, *who art a* Jew, *and expectest no other Messiah than a mere Man, Man begotten of Man, can take no advantage of my Mistake; it is good against you still* (*i*). *Episcopius* proceeds to argue thus from the Place of *Justin: He affirms that if this Point can be made good, namely, that Jesus is the Christ, or Messiah; it may and ought to satisfy a* Jew, *tho he knew not, or deny'd, or could not prove that Jesus pre-existed as the Son of God, or even affirm'd that he was no more than mere Man.* I scarce know what the learned Man means here. Does he mean, that if a *Jew* could only prove, and was only persuaded that Jesus was the Christ, or Messiah, that it would be sufficient for his Salvation, tho he knew not, or deny'd that Jesus pre-existed the Son of God, and even affirm'd that he was nothing but mere Man, begotten of Man? He must either intend this, or he has said nothing to the purpose. But then where has *Justin* affirm'd this? If this was indeed his Opinion, he has taken a great deal of pains in this Dialogue to no purpose, and gather'd Arguments from every part of the Old Testament to convince the *Jews* that it was foretold of Christ, or the Messiah, that he

(*i*) *See* Ch. 7. §. 4, 5.

should

ſhould both be God, and born Man of a Virgin. In vain does he ſo often and ſo ſharply correct and reprove their unparallel'd Obſtinacy, in that they would not believe and confeſs theſe things; nay, ſometimes he even bewails and compaſſionates them as forſaken of God, and blinded by his juſt Judgment. Surely when he did thus, he was not in earneſt; for if *Epiſcopius* ſay true, he at the ſame time thought, it was not neceſſary for the *Jews* thus to believe, it was enough for their Salvation, to make a Meſſiah of him ſome way or other. Had it not been better for *Juſtin* to have ſaid nothing of theſe Myſteries, than, by being eager upon unneceſſary Truth, to drive them from an abſolutely neceſſary Faith? But not to multiply words, I have evidently prov'd before, that *Juſtin*, and the Catholick Church of his Times, eſteem'd thoſe *Jews*, the *Ebionites* I mean, to be Hereticks, who confeſs'd Jeſus to be the Chriſt, and yet deny'd his Pre-exiſtence before Ages, and his Nativity of the Virgin, and held them to be Aliens from the true ſaving Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt. After theſe things, the Remonſtrants urge thoſe words, [*For there are ſome of our Sort*] but they have been clearly *anſwer'd* before (*k*). Theſe are the Arguments which *Epiſcopius* and the Remonſtrants boaſt of as the moſt clear imaginable; with what Judgment and Fidelity, let the impartial Reader judge.

3. Let us now proceed to the Arguments he propoſes as highly probable, but what, I confeſs, I ſhould never have dreamt of without his aſſiſtance. (1.) He urges, (*l*) *That thoſe words of* Juſtin [Nor will very many ſay ſo, who are of my Opinion] *ſeem to ſhew that there were a few of that Opinion, in his Community. For he has not ſaid* [No one of thoſe who are of my Opinion (*in contradiſtinction to the other Heretical Sects, the* Marcionites, Valentinians, *&c. whom he always diſtinguiſhes from his own*) would ſay ſo] *but* [very few, *&c.*]

(*k*) Ch. 7. §. 6. (*l*) Epiſcop. p. 296.

Here

Here then you have this Argument: *The Words of* Juſtin [Nor will very many ſay ſo, who are of my Opinion] *ſhew that ſome (but a few) in the Church, where he communicated, believed Chriſt to be only Man begotten of Man: Therefore the Church in* Juſtin's *Time held Communion with thoſe, who believed Chriſt mere Man.* I own the Conſequence is very juſt: But without *Epiſcopius*'s Spectacles, there is no finding the Antecedent. *Epiſcopius* takes the words, as tho they imply'd a Partition or Diſtinction: [*Nor will very many of them, who are of my Opinion, ſay ſo.*] But this is wrong. The *Greek* will not bear it. Beſides, thoſe he calls [*that are of my Opinion*] are here plainly, ſuch as thought the ſame concerning Chriſt as *Juſtin* did, namely, that he was before Ages, and made Man of a Virgin; never a one of which, you may be ſure, would ſay that he was Man begotten of Man. This is evident from *Trypho*'s Anſwer immediately following: *I think,* ſays he, *they who ſay he was made Man, and by Election anointed and conſtituted Chriſt, ſpeak more probably than thoſe who ſay as you ſay.* Here no doubt [*thoſe who ſay as you ſay*] are the ſame with thoſe call'd by *Juſtin* [*who are of my Opinion*] but [*thoſe who ſay as you ſay*] are without doubt ſuch as with him affirm'd that Chriſt both pre-exiſted as God, and was born of a Virgin as Man, whoſe Opinion *Trypho* oppoſes, and prefers before it theirs, who aſſerted he was made Man, and by Election anointed and conſtituted Chriſt. It is then manifeſt that the Words in Controverſy are explicatory, not diſtinctive; that πλειστοι is oppos'd to τινες, which went before, and that therefore the Words of *Juſtin* muſt be underſtood in this ſenſe: There are ſome, O *Trypho*, of our Sort, or rather of your Nation, who confeſs that Jeſus is the Chriſt, and yet affirm that he is only a Man begotten of Man. I'm not of their Opinion; nor indeed would far the greateſt part of Chriſtians ſay ſo, for in this Point they think as I do. Who now would conclude from this, as *Epiſcopius* does, that there were ſome, with whom

Juſtin

Juſtin held Communion, who thought our Saviour to be only mere Man? To this you may add, that it was impoſſible the Heterodox, of whom *Juſtin* ſpeaks, ſhould have any Place in the Congregation or Aſſembly of any Catholick Church; becauſe they not only deny'd the Divinity of our Lord, but alſo his Nativity as Man of the Virgin: and that they might ſupport both their Hypotheſes, plainly rejected the Goſpels receiv'd in the Catholick Church, and read in her Sacred Aſſemblies. Nay, thoſe in *Juſtin*'s time, who publickly deny'd the Divinity of Chriſt our Lord, could not be preſent at the Divine Service of the Catholicks, without deriding the Chriſtian Worſhip. For in the Liturgies of the Catholick Church, both in *Juſtin*'s time, and before, even from the beginning, our Saviour was ador'd and glorify'd as God. *Juſtin* himſelf bears witneſs of his own Age, as we have ſhewn before; and before *Juſtin*, *Pliny* (*m*) reports this from the Confeſſion of the Chriſtian Apoſtates: *They affirm'd this was all their Crime, or their Error, that they uſually met at an appointed time before day, and ſung an alternate Hymn to Chriſt, as God.* A *Catholick Author* (*n*) has appeal'd to theſe Hymns, againſt *Artemon*, who impudently rejected the Opinion of the Church concerning our Saviour's Divinity, as novel: *The Pſalms and Hymns, all that have been wrote by the faithful Brethren, celebrate the Word of God as God.* Nay, the Confeſſion of our Lord's Divinity was ſo plain and expreſs in thoſe Hymns, that *Paulus Samoſatenus* for that reaſon could not bear them, and even attempted (as the *Antiochian* Fathers tell us in their Synodical Epiſtle) to throw them out of all the Churches under his Government. The ſecond of *Epiſcopius*'s highly probable Arguments, is this: *Thoſe words* [of our Sort] *ſeem to imply a more near Relation and Communion of Faith, than that, which is only nominal and external. Now* Juſtin *ſays of theſe Men, whom he*

(*m*) Plinij Ep. Ed. Hackran. 1669. Lib. 10. Ep. 97. p. 714.
(*n*) Euſeb. E. H. Lib. 7. Cap. 30. p. 229.

calls

calls [of his own Sort] *that they did not deny him to be the Christ, or that it did not follow from their Opinion, that Jesus was not the Christ.* This Argument is made up of two, which I particularly confuted (*o*) *before.* Concerning the words [*of our Sort*] see *Cap.* 7. *Sect.* 6. And as for the Reason, which *Episcopius* subjoins, we have proved that to be a gross *Mistake* of his.

5. The third Argument is this: *It should not seem very strange to any one, that* Justin *took those for Members of the true Church, who thought our Lord was mere Man; when he also esteem'd* Socrates *and* Heraclitus *to be Christians, who lived with Christ, the first-begotten of God: as* Scultetus *in his Analysis of the Apology for the Christians to* Antoninus Pius (that is, *Justin's*) *reports from* Justin. A strange, foreign, far-fetch'd Argument! But however, I answer, I have clearly shewn before, that *Justin* held all those Professors of Christianity, who did not take Christ for the true God, the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and did not worship him as such, to be impious Hereticks, with whom neither he, nor the Catholick Church, had any Communion. As for the Heterodox also, noted in the Place before us, I have fairly prov'd that both *Justin*, and all Catholicks, esteem'd them heretical upon more accounts than one. Therefore if that is true, which *Episcopius* alledges from *Scultetus*, namely, that *Justin* took *Socrates* and *Heraclitus* for true Christians, this only will follow, that the holy Man had conceiv'd a better Opinion of *Socrates* and *Heraclitus* than of those Hereticks. Nor should any one admire, if *Justin* thought more honourably, and hoped better of the Heathens, who, without Divine Revelation, according to their small Portion of Light and Knowledge, worshipped one God, the Maker of all things, and follow'd after Vertue, (as he was of opinion that *Socrates* and *Heraclitus* did) than of those, who, boasting themselves Christians, did impudently and wickedly reject the first

(*o*) Ch. 7. §. 4, 5.

Principles of their Religion reveal'd by God, and abundantly confirm'd by so many, and so great Miracles, plainly deliver'd by Christ and his Apostles, for this reason, that they could not with their weak Heads comprehend the whole Method and Reason of them.

But when *Justin*, in the (*p*) Apology inscrib'd the Second, calls *Socrates* and *Heraclitus* Christians, he does not mean Christians absolutely and perfectly, but in part only, and so far as they follow'd the Guidance of right Reason, despis'd the Heathen Idols, and, like the Christians, acknowledg'd and worship'd one God, the Parent of all things; so far as in their Writings they taught, and in their Lives expres's'd, a great deal of very good, and indeed Christian Morality. For *Justin* teaches, that the Reason, which is in every Man, is, as it were, a Seed or Portion of the Divine Word, or Reason that is of Christ, for which cause he calls him *the universal Reason*; and consequently that the *Gentile* Philosophers, who, before the coming of Christ, conform'd their Opinions and Lives to the Rule of that Reason within them, were so far Christians; but that those alone were absolutely Christians, who were taught, and did embrace the Divine Institution and Discipline of the universal Reason, *i. e.* of Christ, deliver'd in the Gospel, and far more excellent than all human Wisdom. This *Justin* partly signifies in that very place *Scultetus* had his eye upon (*q*): *We have been taught*, says he, *that Christ is the first-born of God, and we have before shewn that he is the Reason, of which all Mankind partakes. And they who live rationally, are Christians*, &c. But he gives us his Mind more fully in the Apology commonly publish'd as the first; there, speaking of certain Philosophers among the *Gentiles*, who were hated of their own People, for the excellent Morality they deliver'd by the Seed of Reason, natural to all Mankind; and having again produced the Example of *Heraclitus*, and one *Musonius* his Con-

(*p*) P. 83. (*q*) Ibid.

temporary,

temporary, he presently adds (*r*): *For, as we have shew'd before, the Dæmons have always made all them to be hated, who, according to the best of their power, have endeavour'd to avoid Evil, and live according to Reason. And no wonder if they are found much more active in procuring them hatred, who live according to a Portion of the original Reason* [in some sort rationally] *yea, according to the Knowledge and Theory of the universal Reason, which is Christ.* You see here in what sense *Justin* call'd *Heraclitus* and such Persons Christians, namely, *as they conform'd their Manners in some sort to a Portion of the original Reason, lived according to Reason, and endeavour'd to avoid Evil.* But betwixt them and the true Christians he makes a wide difference; for the true Christians are they, *who live according to the Knowledge and Theory of the universal Reason, which is Christ.* Now if any one suspects that *Justin* thought a Man, by the only Assistance of his natural Reason, might arrive at such a Knowledge of God, as would be sufficient to procure him Life and Bliss, heavenly and eternal, let him hear what he says for himself in the Conclusion of his *Parænesis* (*s*): *You must therefore know this universally, that you can no otherwise learn the things of God and true Religion, than by the Prophets only, those who teach you by Divine Inspiration.* His words are also very expres in his Epistle to *Diognetus* (*t*): *No Man hath known God himself, or discover'd him to another; but he hath exhibited himself, and this he hath done by Faith, by which only it is granted to us to see God.*

6. I come now to *Episcopius*'s fourth and last Argument, which proceeds thus: *If any one*, says he, *reads the Writings of* Justin, *and especially his Dialogue, call'd* Trypho, *with exactness; he will find that* Justin *does indeed acknowledge Christ to be God and Lord; but every where denies him to be Creator of the Universe, and asserts that he is distinct, and different from him not only in Person, but in Nature, tho not in Will and Purpose.*

(*r*) P. 46. (*s*) P. 37. (*t*) P. 499.

Now if this be ſo, it ſhould not be ſtrange that he thought thoſe of his *own Sort*, who believed that he did not pre-exiſt before all other things, or was created, or made in the beginning, but was begotten and born of Man in time. Nor is there ſo great a difference betwixt thoſe Opinions, as to occaſion a Schiſm. For Chriſt is by both defin'd a Creature, and the Queſtion only is, when he began to exiſt. Strange! What is the meaning of thoſe words, that *Juſtin* every where denies Chriſt to be the Creator of the Univerſe? Does *Epiſcopius* mean by them, that *Juſtin* every where denies all created things to be brought out of nothing into Exiſtence by Chriſt, *i. e.* the only begotten Son of God, who exiſted before all Ages, and after he had taken Fleſh upon him, was call'd Chriſt? This is by no means true. For, on the other hand, *Juſtin* every where attributes the Creation of all things to the Son of God, as a Work common to him with God the Father. Thus having firſt ſpoke (*u*) of God the Father, he adds theſe words concerning the Son: *His Son, who is only properly call'd Son, the Word, who was with him before the Creatures, and born, when he firſt made and adorn'd all things by him*, &c. So in another place (*x*): *But this Birth, which really came from the Father before all Creatures, co-exiſted with the Father, and the Father converſed with him*; namely, in thoſe words a little before cited by him: *Let us make Man*, &c. And in the Epiſtle to *Diognetus*, he teaches that the Son is not a Servant, but the very Artificer and Maker of all things. Did *Epiſcopius* then take the words [*Creator of the Univerſe*] perſonally, as they ſay, as they are the Title of God the Father, in reſpect of his being the Fountain of the Deity, and conſequently of all Divine Operations? If this was his meaning, we confeſs *Juſtin* deny'd (as the Catholick Church always did) that Chriſt was God the Father. That was a Tenet condemn'd by the Church at ſeveral times, and

(*u*) P. 44. (*x*) P. 285

in

in the Perſons of divers Hereticks. But *Epiſcopius* proceeds, ſaying that *Juſtin* every where aſſerts Chriſt (in his more excellent Nature, wherein he exiſted before Ages) to be different from the Creator of the Univerſe, that is God the Father; and that not only in Perſon, but in Nature, ſo as to be only a Creature. Surely he who ſeriouſly charges this Hereſy upon *Juſtin*, can't be thought to have read the good Father's Works with any exactneſs. For he is ſo far from it, that no one Place can be alledg'd to this purpoſe. Nay, on the other hand, in the Places *before cited* out of his firſt Apology, and his Dialogue with *Trypho*, he plainly diſtinguiſhes the Word, or Son of God, properly ſo call'd, that is, the true and natural Son of God, from the Creatures, and all thoſe things that are made by God, and attributes to him an Exiſtence coeternal with God the Father. Alſo in the Place cited (*y*) from the Epiſtle to *Diognetus*, he expreſly denies that the Son of God is a Servant, *i. e.* a Creature. In what ſenſe the ſame *Juſtin* elſewhere, and other Primitive Fathers, have call'd him a Servant, and attributed to him a certain Diſpenſation, not compatible with the Father, in which he often from the beginning deſcended to the Earth, and in a viſible Shape converſed with holy Men, you may ſee largely explain'd in *another Place* (*z*). Further, in the ſame Epiſtle to *Diognetus* (*a*), the Son of God is call'd by *Juſtin* [*he who always was*, [but] *to-day is reputed the Son*;] ſo in his *Paræneſis* to the *Greeks*, he obſerves (*b*), that the Angel, who appear'd to *Moſes* in the Buſh, and whom he every where contends was the Son of God, call'd himſelf [*he that is*] and afterwards expreſly notes that that Deſcription belongs to the eternally exiſtent God. Sure he who wrote thus, never dreamt that the Son of God was a Creature.

(*y*) P. 498. (*z*) Defence of the *Nicene* Creed, Sect. 4. Ch. 2. §. 2. & Ch. 3. §. 4, & 5. (*a*) P. 501.
(*b*) P. 19, & 20.

7. Lastly, the Holy Martyr frequently asserts the Consubstantiality of the Son, tho he no where uses the very word, affirming that he is the true, real, genuine Son of God, begotten of the very Essence of the Father, and upon that account very God, as well as the Father, as I have largely shewn *elsewhere* (*c*). I will here very briefly repeat two Places only, which are there more copiously handled, from which it will appear as clearly as possible in what sense *Justin* asserted that the Son of God was different from God the Father. The former Place you find in his first Apology: (*d*) *They that say the Son is the Father, appear neither to know the Father, nor that the Father of the Universe hath a Son, who being the first-born Word of God, is also God.* Here you see that *Justin* so teaches the Son to be different from the Father, as that he is not the Father, but a Person distinct from him; but yet not different from the Father in Nature, for he is upon that account very God, because begotten of God the Father, and that as the Word or Reason of the Father's Mind. For it can't be but that the Reason or Word of the first eternal Mind, *i. e.* of God the Father, should be of the same Nature and Essence with him; which is the cause why the Primitive Fathers commonly use this same Argument to establish the true Divinity of the Son. The Reader will observe with me, by the way, that it is evident even from this single Place, what *Justin* thought of those, who would have Christ to be a mere Man, and not the first-begotten Son of God, and God. He expressly says, that they who deny the Son to be true God, and personally distinct from God the Father, don't know God the Father, *i. e.* are Strangers to true Religion and Salvation. For it is notorious, that [*not to know the Father*] both in Scripture and in the Primitive Fathers, signifies the same as to be destitute of the saving Knowledge of

(*c*) Defence of the *Nicene* Creed, Sect. 2. Ch. 4.
(*d*) P. 96.

God

God the Father. In this ſenſe the Apoſtle St. *John*, (as I have ſuggeſted before) ſays of the Hereticks in his days, who deny'd Chriſt to be the only-begotten Son of God, *He that denies the Son, hath not the Father.* But that the Senſe of this Place may be yet more clear, it is to be obſerv'd that *Juſtin*, in the words before ſpoke of the *Jews*, who contended, that he who appear'd like an Angel to *Moſes* in the Buſh, and ſaid, [*I am he that is, the God of* Abraham, *&c.*] was not the Son of God, but God the Father himſelf. For the *Jews* would not own or worſhip any Son of God, as being God himſelf; flattering themſelves that in this their Obſtinacy they worſhip'd the one God the Father, and that they were not oblig'd to worſhip any other. Now *Juſtin* plainly ſhews, that theſe Men ſtand confuted as well by the Spirit of Prophecy, namely, the Old Teſtament, as by Chriſt himſelf, and that they knew not the Father. Then upon this occaſion, he paſſes, as I think, to the Chriſtian Hereticks, and briefly cenſures them for teaching that the Son of God was the very Father (of which Hereſy ſome were guilty in *Juſtin*'s time, and ſome afterwards, as *Praxeas*, *Noetus*, *Sabellius*, and others) concurring herein with the *Jews*, that they did not acknowledge any Son of God, perſonally diſtinct from God the Father, who was begotten of God the Father, and conſequently was himſelf God; and upon account of this Hereſy, pronounces them, as well as the *Jews*, not to have known God the Father, *i.e.* whatſoever they pretended, to be deſtitute of the ſaving Knowledge of Chriſt. After the Goſpel of Chriſt had been preach'd, and fully explain'd by the Apoſtles, no one could worſhip God the Father as he ought, and ſavingly, unleſs he alſo worſhip'd and reverenc'd God the Son. Does not then this Place of *Juſtin* as truly affect thoſe, who taught that Chriſt was a mere Man, or Creature? Without doubt; for they no more acknowledge the Son of God in *Juſtin*'s Senſe (who, as he is the Word, the firſt-begotten Word of God, is alſo God) than the

Jews, or those Hereticks. But this briefly by the way.

8. I proceed to another Place of *Justin*, in which he professedly handles the Distinction of God the Son from God the Father. It is in that Dialogue with *Trypho*, to which *Episcopius* chiefly appeals. There he relates (*e*) the Opinion of some, that the Son of God did not subsist distinctly from God the Father, but only as a Power issuing forth from the Parent of the Universe. To their Heresy he opposes the Catholick Opinion, in these words: *I have before, in a few words, shewn that the Power, which the Scripture calls God* (as is also proved at large) *and Angel, is not only reckon'd nominally, as the Light of the Sun, but is really and numerically another after an exquisite manner. I have there said, that this Power is begotten of the Father by his Power and Purpose, not by Abscission, as tho the Father's Essence was divided, as all other things, being divided or cut, cease to be the same which they were before. But I gave this Example, that we see other Fires kindled from one Fire, that not being at all diminish'd, but remaining the same, and capable of kindling many.* Here *Justin* plainly teaches, that the Son is personally, or numerically, different from the Father, but not so in Nature; as being begotten of the very Essence of God the Father (not indeed by Section, or Partition of the Divine Essence, but by simple Communication of it, such as is between the Fire produced or kindled, and the Fire which produces or kindles it, without any loss or diminution of itself) and consequently a Son consubstantial with his Father, and true God as well as he (*f*). From what has been said, it is clear that there is the greatest difference between *Justin*'s Opinion and theirs, who taught that Christ was only Man begotten of Man. For, on the one hand, Christ is defin'd to be a mere Creature, nay, nothing more than Man; and,

(*e*) P. 358. (*f*) *You may consult* Defence of the *Nicene* Creed, Sect. 2. Ch. 4. S. 3, 4.

on

on the other hand, he is asserted to be the Son of God, coessential with God his Father, and even very God.

9. After these Arguments (which scarce become an honest Man, who is a little read in *Justin*) *Episcopius* gives us a Corollary; in which, if I mistake not, he has destroy'd all his preceding Disputation, himself being Judge. For from what he had before discours'd, he gathers, that *Justin* by those words [*of his own Sort*] did not mean the *Ebionites*. But how does he gather this? *It is by no means probable*, says he, *that* Justin *intended them by that Phrase, not only because he no where mentions the* Ebionites *in his Writings, but because they also appear to be the worst of Men; for their Master is reported to have loaded the Apostle St.* Paul *with Calumnies, to have accused St.* Peter *of Lying, and to have call'd him partly a* Jew, *an* Essene, *a* Nazaræan, *a* Cerinthian, *and a* Carpocratian: *And they moreover, as* Eusebius *relates* (*g*), *believed that Christ was born of the Coition of* Joseph *and* Mary, *and taught that the Legal Ceremonies must be observ'd. Episcopius* then confesses, that it is by no means probable that *Justin* thought the *Ebionites* of his Sort (as that Phrase seem'd to him to import a near Relation and Communion of Faith) because they were the worst of Men, and taught impious Doctrines. Now who does not see that the Learned Man has ruin'd his own Cause by this Confession? For I have very clearly prov'd before, that *Justin* speaks of no other Persons than the *Ebionites*. But it is strange what *Episcopius* could mean, to prove from *Eusebius* that the *Ebionites* believed Christ to be born of the Coition of *Joseph* and *Mary*, and from that to conclude that *Justin* never spoke of the *Ebionites*. Has not *Justin* expressly signify'd, that the Hereticks, of whom he speaks, taught that Christ was Man begotten of Man? Did not *Episcopius* know the meaning of these words? Does not he, who says Christ was

(*g*) Lib. 3. Cap. 27. p. 79.

Man

Man begotten of Man, at the same time say that Christ was begotten by the Coition of a Man and a Woman, namely, *Joseph* and *Mary?* Surely he who was conceiv'd and form'd by the Holy Ghost in the Womb of a pure Virgin, without the Coition of a Man, could not be Man begotten of Man. Further, it is very frequently declared in this Dialogue what is meant by Christ's being Man begotten of Man. For there *(h) Trypho* prolixly derides the Christian Faith concerning Jesus born of the Virgin *Mary*, compares it to the Fables of the *Greeks* concerning *Perseus* born of the Virgin *Danae*, *Jupiter* descending upon her in the Form of Gold; and then adds, *You who talk as they do, should be ashamed of it, and rather say that this Jesus was Man begotten of Man.* Every one may here plainly see the Import of those words, *Man begotten of Man.* In another Place, in the same Dialogue (*i*), *Justin* proves from the Old Prophets, that Christ was to be born of a Virgin; and from that concludes, that Christ is not Man of Man, begotten in the common way. Lastly, *Justin*, in the very Place before us, plainly tells us what the Hereticks meant, who affirm'd Christ was Man begotten of Man. For he says in the beginning of this Paragraph, that his own, namely, the Catholick Opinion concerning Christ our Lord, was, *That he pre-existed the Son of the Maker of the Universe, and was born Man of the Virgin*; then he subjoins the Opinion of the Hereticks contrary to the Catholick Opinion, *That Christ was Man begotten of Man.* From this it is evident, that those Hereticks deviated from the Truth two ways: 1. As they taught that Christ was only Man, not pre-existing as the Son of God before *Mary*, 2. That Christ was Man begotten of Man, not of the Virgin *Mary* by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit.

From this and other Arguments we may conjecture that *Episcopius* and *his* Remonstrants read the Passage

(*h*) P. 291. (*i*) P. 274.

of

of *Justin*, they so greatly boasted of, very hastily first, (hurry'd away with the Sound of Words upon the first hearing, apparently favourable to their Prejudices) and afterwards, neither accurately weigh'd the Words themselves, nor the Context. But however that may be, this is very sure, that the Learned Men have in vain alledg'd it, to prove, *That the Antient Primitive Church of the Christians held Communion with them, who believed and professed that Jesus Christ was only mere Man, Man begotten of Man, and constituted Christ by Election.*

To the most Holy and Undivided Trinity, God the Father, and his coeternal and coessential Word and Son, incarnate for our Salvation, together with the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, be given by Angels and Men all Praise, Honour and Glory for ever and ever. Amen.

THE

THE
Primitive *and* Apostolical
TRADITION,
CONCERNING
The receiv'd Doctrine in the Catholick Church, of Our Saviour JESUS CHRIST's Divinity;

Asserted and plainly prov'd, against DANIEL ZUICKER, a *Prussian*, and his late Disciples in *England*.

The INTRODUCTION.

THAT *Jesus Christ*, our Saviour, was not only Man, but the living and subsisting Word of God, who was with God before any thing was created, and therefore eternally; who was God, by whom all things were made, that were made, whether visible or invisible; and who, in the fulness of time, was made Flesh for us Men, and for our

our Salvation, *i. e.* took the true human Nature into the Unity of his Perſon from the Virgin; is the plain Doctrine of the *New Teſtament*, propagated and preſerv'd by a conſtant and perpetual Tradition of all the Churches founded by Chriſt's Apoſtles. This notwithſtanding, there have been, and alas! there are now, even in our own Country, wicked Men, inſtigated by the Devil, yet pretending Chriſtianity, who not only don't acknowledge this ſacred Doctrine, but alſo oppoſe it with all their might, and perſecute it with the moſt foul Reproaches and Blaſphemies. Our *Ebionites* elude the force of that Scripture-Evidence, which clearly aſſerts that Chriſt is God, one one way, and another another. Moſt of them wreſt and pervert thoſe places, as their Fathers did, to a Senſe remote from the Context, and the evident Propriety of the Words. But (*a*) *ſome are arrived* at that height of impudence and wickedneſs, (Allies to the *Turks* and *Mahometans* for the deſtruction of Chriſtianity) as openly and audaciouſly to affirm, That the Scriptures of the *New Teſtament* are foully corrupted and interpolated by the Catholick Chriſtians. Even (*b*) *Socinus*, if he was amongſt us again, wou'd excommunicate theſe Monſters in Chriſtianity. As for Eccleſiaſtical Tradition, they all contend, that no true Tradition derived from the times of the Apoſtles can be produced for the Catholick Opinion; that the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors preach'd the pure naked Goſpel, that is, taught their Opinion concerning the mere Humanity of Chriſt; but that not long after, the Myſtery of Iniquity forſooth began to work, and the Purity and Simplicity of the Goſpel was adulterated by *Platonick* Philoſophers who embraced Chriſtianity, and eſpecially by *Juſtin*.

2. The firſt Author of this abſurd Opinion, if I'm not miſtaken, was the Perſon who wrote the

(*a*) *The Hiſtorical Defence of the naked Goſpel, the Preface. The Judgment of the Fathers*, &c. p. 22.

(*b*) Socin. Authoritas Scrip. Cap. 1. §. 3.

Ire-

Irenicum Irenicorum, a violent *Ebionite*, one *Daniel Zuicker*, as the *Anti-trinitarian Bibliotheque* has lately inform'd us. For he in his *Irenicum*, searching into the Original of the Change made in the Apoſtles Doctrine concerning Chriſt, gives us this tedious Tale (*c*) : (1.) *It is probable that the Diſciples of* Simon Magus *corrupted the ſound Doctrine concerning God and Chriſt, by feigning a new Generation of Chriſt, and conſequently introducing a new Chriſt; this* (*d*) Hegeſippus *atteſts. Then that thoſe Hereticks made certain Verſes under the name of* Orpheus, *concerning the Word of the Father pronounc'd by him, before the Creation. Further, that* Juſtin *firſt of all deceiv'd by the Arts and Reveries of the* Simonians, *and relying upon the* Orphaic *Verſes as others did, propos'd his Opinion concerning the Generation of Chriſt, or the Mind, Word, and Reaſon of the Father, from the Father, before the Creation, that the World might be made by him, and that he might deſcend to Men, and at length be made Man. Laſtly, that there were ſeveral other Cauſes which might lead* Juſtin *and his Followers into this Doctrine; namely, the knowlege of, and affection for the* Platonick *Philoſophy, the memory of* Gentiliſm *and many Gods not yet obliterated, the cuſtom of deifying excellent Men, and the ſuperſtition and dread of worſhipping mere Man*, &c. From all which he at laſt concludes, that he has done the Buſineſs, and laid open the Original of the new Production of Chriſt, and conſequently of a new Chriſt.

3. When I read theſe things many years ago in the Author of the *Irenicum*, I quickly drew up a ſhort Confutation of the monſtrous Fable, not intending it for the Publick ; but when I ſaw not long ſince, that this ſtuff of *Zuicker's* was again brought upon the Stage with pomp and oſtentation by our *Unitarians*, I reviſed this ſhort Confutation, and, as I had opportunity, enlarg'd it. This ſo improv'd (upon the Bookſeller's Application, that if I had any larger Treatiſe

(*c*) Irenicum, p. 14, 15, 16.
(*d*) Euſeb. *E. H.* Lib. 4. Cap. 22. p. 115.

ready

ready by me, I would ſuffer him to print it off with the new Edition of my Works) I offer to thy Candour, Gentle Reader.

CHAP. I.

That Juſtin *was not the firſt who introduced the Doctrine of our Saviour's Pre-exiſtence before the World was made, and of the Creation of all things by him, into the Chriſtian Churches.*

FIRST then, the Author of the *Irenicum* lays this Foundation of his ruinous Structure, That *Juſtin* introduc'd the Doctrine of the Son's Generation of God the Father before the Creation, into the Chriſtian Churches. For he ſays, that *Juſtin* deceiv'd by the deluſion of the *Gnoſticks*, firſt propos'd that Opinion. He alſo ſays *elſewhere* (*e*) in expreſs Words: *That no one can be cited more ancient than* Juſtin Martyr, *who has in his writings aſcrib'd the divine Nature to Chriſt, and call'd him God before Ages; and that the Opinion of the* Artemonites (*who taught that Chriſt was mere Man*) *did at leaſt obtain in the Church from the days of the Apoſtles till* Juſtin's, *and then at length was chang'd.* Our late *Socinians*, or as they affect to be call'd *Unitarians*, have follow'd him in this, and eſpecially the Author of a Book wrote in *Engliſh*, intitled, [*The Judgment of the Fathers about the Doctrine of the Trinity, againſt Mr.* G. Bull's *Defence of the* Nicene Creed] who frequently in that Treatiſe, makes *Juſtin* the firſt Author of the Doctrine concerning the Son of God coexiſting with God the Father before every Creature. But who can believe this Fable? For beſides the great improbability that

(*e*) Irenicum Irenicorum, p. 7.

a very wise and pious Man (such *Justin* was without doubt) could either be so deluded in a Fundamental of Christianity by the Frauds of the worst of Hereticks; or wou'd coin new Doctrines, and introduce a new Faith as different as possible from that of his Ancestors, and Apostolical Tradition, (which he who flourish'd in the first Succession of the Apostles could not but know:) besides this, (which is a sufficient confutation of this wild Fancy) we have other Arguments, which very evidently prove, that the Doctrine of the Son's Pre-existence before the World was made, and of the Creation of all things by him, is not the Figment or Device of *Justin*, but the commonly receiv'd Faith of the Church before his time.

2. First, *Justin* himself, in his *Dialogue* with *Trypho*, expresly witnesseth, that not only he, but the Christians of his days commonly thought and believed that Christ was God before Ages; except *a few* known Hereticks, who not only deny'd the Pre-existence of our Saviour before Ages, but also his Nativity of the *Virgin* (*f*). Again, the same *Justin* set forth his Confession concerning the Divinity of the Son of God, not as his own only, or some private one, but as the publick and notorious Faith and Opinion of all true Christians of his time; and this before the *Roman* Emperor and Senate, as is clear from the Exhortation to the *Gentiles*, and both his Apologies: What then, was this Consent of Christians owing to *Justin* only? Did he travel the World over to preach this Doctrine? Or had he his Apostles to propagate it every where? Cou'd it be that this one Man should destroy the Apostolical Tradition, change the receiv'd Faith of the Church, and obtrude (as *Zuicker* speaks) even a new Christ upon the Christian World? Durst no Disciple of the Apostles oppose this impudent Innovator? Durst not *Polycarp* himself, who had St. *John* for his Master, who

(*f*) *See the place cited entire, and largely explain'd in the* Judgment of the Catholick Church, *c.* 7.

was

was alive when *Justin* publish'd and defended the Doctrine of the Son's Divinity in his Writings, and who liv'd a long time after? No sober Man can think these things credible.

3. Besides, there are yet extant Writings of the Fathers, who flourish'd some years before *Justin*, even in the Apostolical Age, namely the Catholick Epistle of *Barnabas*, the Shepherd of *Hermes*, and the Epistles of *Ignatius* the Martyr, out of which we have cited clear Testimonies of our Lord's Divinity, and largely defended them from the Cavils of the *Irenicum* (*g*.) These Writings indeed, the *English* Author beforemention'd entirely despises, and, as his custom is, even reproaches and derides the Authors of them. But the most learned Men, as well Antients as Moderns, have thought otherwise of them, Men whose Judgment is much to be preferr'd before the Censure of that Scoffer. As for the Shepherd of *Hermes*, and the Epistle ascrib'd to *Barnabas*, we constantly affirm these two things of them, what he durst not deny, and which come up to our purpose: (1.) That they are pieces of the most early Antiquity, and prior to *Justin Martyr*. (2.) That they were so far approv'd by the Church, as to be read publickly in the sacred Assembles, together with the Canonical Scriptures in the primitive days. The seven Epistles of *Ignatius*, known to *Eusebius*, and publish'd in *Greek* by *Is. Vossius* (which only we have used) our very learned *Pearson* has abundantly prov'd to be the genuine Works of the Holy Martyr in his Vindication of them, to which I refer the Reader.

4. Moreover there were learned and pious Men before *Justin*, who set forth Apologies for our Religion against the *Gentiles*, among whom were *Quadratus* Bishop of *Athens*, and *Aristides*, who presented their Apologies to *Adrian* in the beginning of his Reign. These Apologists were oblig'd to vindicate the Chri-

(*g*) *Defence of* Nicene Creed, *Sect.* 2. *Ch.* 2.

ſtians from worſhipping a Man, and to refute that common Objection, *You worſhip a Man that was born and crucify'd.* Nor could any of them anſwer this, without declaring his Opinion concerning our Saviour's Perſon, and ſhewing himſelf either a Catholick, or Heterodox upon that Article. Now (*h*) *Euſebius* and *Jerome* (*i*) atteſt, That *Quadratus* and *Ariſtides* prov'd themſelves Catholicks in their Apologies. Of *Quadratus*, *Euſebius* ſays (*k*), *He offer'd his Oration in defence of our Religion to* Adrian. *It is now extant in the hands of moſt of our Brethren, and I myſelf have it. From it you may ſee plain tokens of the Man's Sentiment, and of Apoſtolical Orthodoxy.* To *Quadratus*, he adds his Contemporary *Ariſtides* as one of the ſame Character. In like manner, *Jerome* calls the Apologetic of *Quadratus* a very uſeful Book, full of Reaſon and Faith, and becoming the Apoſtolical Doctrine. Of *Ariſtides* alſo he writes thus in the following Chapter: Ariſtides *a very eloquent* Athenian *Philoſopher, and a Diſciple of Chriſt, in his former Philoſophical Habit, preſented a Book to the Emperor* Adrian, *at the ſame time* Quadratus *did, containing an account of our Tenet.* Without doubt then, in *Jerome*'s opinion, *Quadratus* and *Ariſtides* held the Standard and Rule of the Apoſtolical Faith in their Apologetics. The Force of this Argument in ſhort is this: It is certain the Catholick Church gave divine Honours to our Saviour in the times of *Quadratus* and *Ariſtides* (and conſequently from the beginning) as we ſhall ſhew hereafter in this Chapter. It is alſo certain, that the Heathens did eſpecially object that as a Crime to the Chriſtians; and therefore it was neceſſary they ſhould obviate this Objection in the firſt place in their Defences of Chriſtianity. This we ſee was done by all the Apologiſts, whoſe Works we have. Laſtly, it is certain that the Catholick Church of Chriſt (as alſo the *Jewiſh* Church before Chriſt)

(*h*) Euſeb. Lib. 4. Cap. 3. Pag. 94.
(*i*) Catalog. Eccleſ. Scriptor. in Quadrato. (*k*) Ibidem.

held

held it for a Point fix'd and establish'd, That Divine Worship was only due to God, and that to pay it to a mere Man, or Creature, was certainly Idolatry; which Decree of the Universal Church we shall hereafter (*l*) clearly demonstrate in its proper place, to be supported by the Scriptures of the *Old* and *New Testament*, and by good Reasons.

It follows then, that the Worship and Religion of Christians can't be defended, consistently with the Principles of the Catholick Church, by any one, who does not own that Christ is really God. But *Eusebius* and *Jerome* expressly testify, That the Apologies of *Quadratus* and *Aristides* were truly Catholick, entirely consistent with the Catholick Rule, and the Apostolick Faith. To these you may add, if you please, the Observation of *Petavius* (*m*), that in the *Roman* Martyrology and that of *Ado*, *Notkerus*, *&c.* it is reported, *That* Aristides *the* Athenian *presented a Book to the Emperor* Adrian *concerning the Christian Religion, containing the Reason of our Tenets; and that he very clearly and fully discours'd, in the presence of the Emperor, that Jesus Christ was the only God.*

5. I must here also repeat a plain Testimony of *Eusebius* cited before, where he says, he had learnt from the Monuments of antient Authors, that all the fifteen Bishops, who presided over the Church of *Jerusalem* till the times of *Adrian*, were of the Circumcision, and yet receiv'd the genuine Knowledge of Christ: But they only, according to *Eusebius*, receiv'd the genuine Knowledge of Christ, who *confess'd*, that he pre-existed, being God and the Wisdom. Thus in (*n*) *another* place he interprets himself, where he distinguishes the Catholicks and Orthodox from the Heretical *Ebionites*, by this Character, That they [*the Ebionites*] had a low and mean Opinion of Christ. What says the Author of *the Judgment of the Fathers*, *&c.* to this? Hear him, and you must

(*l*) Ch. 8. (*m*) In præfat. ad Tom. 2. Dogm. Theolog. (*n*) Lib. 3. Cap. 27. p. 79.

wonder at his Impudence. *We grant*, says he (*o*), *that* Eusebius *affirm'd those Bishops of* Jerusalem *profess'd the true Knowledge of Christ*; *but we answer, that he had this from* Hegesippus. *Now* Hegesippus *was himself a Jewish Christian, that is, one of those, who thought our Saviour was a mere Man*; *therefore when he said the Bishops of* Jerusalem *profess'd the true Knowledge of Christ, without doubt he meant, that our Lord was truly a mere Man, against the* Docetæ, *who taught that Christ pre-existed, and deny'd that he was truly Man.* But, (1.) he must make *Eusebius* a dull Creature indeed, a Man of no Parts, nor Judgment, who can think he so foully mistook in citing the Authors, whose Testimonies he made use of. *Eusebius* says, That he had learnt from the antient Monuments, that the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, down to *Adrian*, had receiv'd the genuine Knowledge of Christ, *i. e.* in his Sense, had acknowledg'd the true Divinity of Christ our Lord. But the Author or Authors he referr'd to, if we may believe this Fellow, intended the direct contrary; namely, that those Bishops where *Ebionites*, that is, took our Saviour to be only mere Man. (2.) *Eusebius* (*p*) does not name *Hegesippus*, as he used to do, when he cites any thing from him, but only in general says, he had it from the Writings of the Antients. *Eusebius* had read many other Authors besides *Hegesippus*, which the large Library at *Jerusalem*, founded by *Alexander*, Bishop of that City, afforded him. Of which he thus writes: *At the same time*, (*namely in the Reign of* Antoninus) *many learned Ecclesiasticks flourish'd, whose Epistles to one another are yet preserv'd, and easy to be found*; *for they are now in the Library at* Ælia, *founded by* Alexander, *Bishop of that City, from which we have been enabled to collect the Matter of our present Work.* Besides, *Eusebius* (*q*) had also the Use of that noble Library of the Martyr *Pamphilus*, in which there were Eccleſi-

(*o*) P. 43. (*p*) Lib. 6. Cap. 20. p. 180, & 181.
(*q*) Lib. 6. Cap. 32. p. 188.

astical

aſtical Authors *collected* by the Bleſſed Man from all parts. (3.) But grant that *Euſebius* wrote this from *Hegeſippus*, what then? *Hegeſippus*, he ſays, was an Unitarian, and believ'd our Saviour to be a mere Man. Nothing can be more falſe. I deſire to know from what Author he had his Information? from one *Zuicker* (I ſuppoſe) Author of the *Irenicum*, a blind Leader of the Blind. Now that *Hegeſippus* was a Catholick, and conſtantly perſiſted in the Communion of the Catholick Church, in which the Faith concerning the Divine and Human Nature of Chriſt obtain'd, we ſhall evidently prove hereafter in a more convenient place.

6. After the Teſtimony of *Euſebius* (not in the firſt place, as the Sophiſter we have to deal with impudently affirms) we cited a very grave Hiſtorian, *Sulpitius Severus*, who expreſly (*r*) ſays, that the Primitive Church at *Jeruſalem*, which had no Biſhops but of the Circumciſion till *Adrian*'s time, *believ'd Chriſt to be God, and obſerv'd the Law.* What ſays the Trifler to this again? *Whereas*, ſays he, Sulpitius *affirms, that thoſe Chriſtians believ'd in Chriſt as God, I've prov'd that he is miſtaken, from the Teſtimonies of thoſe Fathers, who convers'd with the* Jewiſh *Chriſtians*, Origen *and* Theodoret, *and of other Fathers, who were nearer to them than* Sulpitius, *namely* Epiphanius *and St.* Auſtin. Sure nothing can be weaker than this Anſwer. *Sulpitius* ſpeaks of the Primitive Church at *Jeruſalem*, which flouriſh'd under her own Biſhops of the Circumciſion, till the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem* under *Adrian.* But did *Origen* and *Theodoret* converſe with theſe *Jewiſh* Chriſtians? or were *Epiphanius*, and St. *Auſtin*, nearer to them than *Sulpitius? Sulpitius* expreſly affirms, concerning the Chriſtians of the Primitive Church at *Jeruſalem*, that they believ'd in Chriſt as God. *Euſebius* had ſaid the ſame before him, and that by the Authority of the moſt antient Eccleſiaſtical Monuments. Has *Origen*, or *Theodoret*, or *Epiphanius*, or *Auſtin*, or

(*r*) Hiſt. Sacr. Lib. 2. Cap. 45.

any other Father contradicted *Eusebius* and *Sulpitius* in this Point? Not at all. For they speak of the *Jewish* Christians, or *Ebionites*, or *Nazareans*, of their own times, that is, of a much later Age, and very differently. I have in (*s*) *another Place* largely discours'd upon the *Nazareans* of the later Ages, and their Opinion concerning the Person of Christ. It will not be amiss, however, just to repeat the Heads of what I have said there, and vindicate them from the Cavils of my troublesome Adversary.

7. First, I have alledg'd *Austin*'s Testimony thus: Austin *in his Book of Heresies* (*t*), *after he had treated of the* Cerinthians, *who taught, That we must be circumcised, and observe the other like Precepts of the Law; That Jesus was only a Man,* &c. *explains the Tenets of the* Ebionites *and* Nazareans *thus* (*u*): *The* Nazareans, *tho they confess Christ to be the Son of God* (*and therefore in this dissent from the* Cerinthians, *who would have it that he is only Man*) *yet* (*in this agreeing with the* Cerinthians) *they observe all the Precepts of the Old Law, which the Christians by Apostolical Tradition have learnt not to observe carnally, but to understand in a spiritual sense. The* Ebionites *also* (*as well as the* Cerinthians *aforesaid*) *say that Christ is only Man, observe the Carnal Precepts of the Law,* &c. Here it is plain, against all the Cavils of the *Irenicum*, *That* Austin *intended to distinguish the* Nazareans *both from the* Cerinthians *and* Ebionites, *in this, that the* Nazareans *confess'd Christ not only to be Man, as the* Cerinthians *and* Ebionites *did, but also the Son of God discretively, and consequently God.* Here my Adversary accuses me of Impudence, for inferring from this Testimony of St. *Austin*, that the *Nazareans* thought Christ to be so the Son of God, as that he was born of God before all Ages; whereas I was conscious to myself, that the *Ebionites*, who believ'd Christ to be only mere Man, own'd him to be the Son of God. I reply, that the

(*s*) Judgment of the Catholick Church, Ch. 2. §. 13, &c.
(*t*) De Hæresibus, Cap. 8. (*u*) Cap. 9, & 10.

Ebionites

Ebionites indeed call'd Chriſt the Son of God, but not in *Auſtin*'s ſenſe, or that of the *Nazareans*, of whom he ſpeaks. For in this *Auſtin* plainly diſtinguiſhes the *Nazareans* from the *Ebionites*, that the latter deny'd that Chriſt was the Son of God, but the former own'd it. Does he not plainly oppoſe the Opinion of the *Nazareans*, who confeſs'd our Saviour to be the Son of God, to the Opinion of the *Ebionites* and *Cerinthians*, who taught that he was only Man? Therefore in the Senſe of *Auſtin* and the *Nazareans*, to own Chriſt for the Son of God, is the ſame as to profeſs that he is not only Man. The Sophiſter proceeds then as tho he would correct my Interpretation of St. *Auſtin*, and give his Reader the genuine Text, and Senſe of it. *But let us recite the very Words of St.* Auſtin (*x*): *The* Nazareans, *as they confeſs Chriſt to be the Son of God, ſo they obſerve the whole Law. The* Ebionites *alſo ſay, that Chriſt is only Man. Theſe words* [the *Ebionites* alſo ſay that Chriſt is only Man] *would be plainly abſurd, unleſs the* Nazareans, *of whom he ſpake immediately before, had likewiſe held that Chriſt was a mere Man.* But this is not reciting *Auſtin*'s own Words, but corrupting and depraving the Integrity of his Text. *Auſtin* has it [*cum*, that is, *quanquam* or *tho*;] inſtead of that, this Author gives us [*ſicut*, or *as*;] St. *Auſtin* [*tamen*, or *yet*] he [*ita*, or *ſo*.] And, what is the top of his Artifice, the Sophiſter has wholly omitted what *Auſtin* ſays in the Chapter juſt before, concerning the Opinion of the *Cerinthians*, tho, at the ſame time, his genuine Senſe in the following words can't be underſtood without them. Now if you'll attend to thoſe preceding words, you'll find that St. *Auſtin*'s [*etiam*, or *alſo*] in explaining the Opinion of the *Ebionites*, plainly belongs to the *Cerinthians*, not the *Nazareans*. Let the learned and impartial Reader conſult St. *Auſtin*, and I doubt not but that he will be of my opinion.

(*x*) Cap. 9, & 10.

8. To the Teſtimony of St. *Auſtin*, I add (*y*) *Jerome*'s Suffrage, who writes thus concerning the *Nazareans* (with whom he was very well acquainted:) *Even now there is a Hereſy among the* Jews *throughout all the Synagogues of the Eaſt, call'd the* Minei, *commonly* Nazareans, *who believe in Chriſt, the Son of God, born of the Virgin* Mary; *they ſay he it is that ſuffer'd under* Pontius Pilate, *and aroſe again, in whom we alſo believe: But whilſt they affect to be both* Jews *and* Chriſtians, *they are neither.* In theſe words *Jerome*, as well as St. *Auſtin*, expreſly ſays that the *Nazareans* believed in Chriſt the Son of God; and not reſting here, he explains himſelf, affirming that they believed in that Son of God, in which we alſo [*the Catholicks*] believe: ſo that in this Point he owns no difference between the Catholicks and the *Nazareans*. Mark (if you can, without Horror) what this vile ſacrilegious Talker anſwers to this: *One would have thought* (ſays he) *when the* Nazareans *here ſay that they believed in the Son of God, born of a Virgin, kill'd under* Pontius Pilate, *and then raiſed from the Dead, that they ſufficiently declared their Meaning, namely, that the Son of God, in whom they believed, was the Man Chriſt Jeſus; not that Son of God which could not be born of a Virgin, could not die and riſe from the Dead. But becauſe* Jerome *adds* [in whom we alſo believe] *Dr.* Bull *cries out*, Obſerve, the *Nazareans* believed in that Son of God, in whom the Orthodox believed. *We own it, Dr.* Bull *believed in the Son of God born of the Virgin, dead, and raiſed again. Tho the Orthodox (ſo call'd) have contriv'd another Son of God alſo, a Son which could neither be begotten of* Mary, *nor born, nor die. A Son coeval with his Father, a ſecondary Almighty, another Creator, firſt diſcover'd and ſet forth by the* Nicene *Fathers.* The Senſe of this Anſwer is this: Whoſoever profeſſes to believe in the Son of God, born of the Virgin, who ſuffer'd and died under *Pontius Pilate*; by that declares that he believes in a Son of God, who is only Man,

(*y*) Ep. 89. ad Auguſtin.

not

not God. For the Divine Nature being impassible, could not be born of a Virgin, could not die and rise again. But the *Nazareans* profess'd that they believed in the Son of God, born of the Virgin, *&c.* Therefore they did not believe in the Son of God, who is God. But the Catholick Church of Christ before the Council of *Nice*, and the *Nazareans*, as well as the Catholicks, according to *Jerome*, always believed in the Son of God, who, tho very God, at the time appointed took upon him human Flesh of the Virgin, died in it, and afterwards rose from the Dead. For he says, The *Nazareans* believed in that Son of God, in whom we also [*the Catholicks*] believe. Besides, in that Epistle *Jerome* had, in Imagination, made *Austin* his Adversary upon the Question, and had undertaken plainly to prove, that those, who observed the Ritual Law of *Moses*, were always by the Church deem'd Hereticks. This he first attempts from the Examples of the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*; but conscious to himself, that *Ebion* was condemn'd of Heresy for denying Christ's Divinity, and that *Cerinthus* was excommunicated for the same Crime, and many other impious Tenets, he recedes of his own accord from these Examples, and has recourse to another unexceptionable Argument from the *Nazareans*. *But why*, says he, *do I speak of the* Ebionites, *who only pretend Christianity? Even now there is a Heresy*, &c. As tho he should have said: You'll perhaps object against the *Ebionites*, and I don't deny it, that they had impious Opinions concerning our Lord Christ, teaching that he was only Man, pretending to be Christians, but really not to be esteem'd such: but then, as to the *Nazareans*, what can you say, who thought as we do concerning our Lord's Person, and yet were accounted Hereticks by the Church, only for their Observance of the *Ritual Law* (z).

(z) *See this more at large in the* Judgment of the Catholick Church, Ch. 2. Sect. 13.

9. From

9. From St. *Auſtin* and *Jerome*, I come to an (*a*) Author much more antient than either of them, who lived in the days of *Adrian*, the Emperor, in whoſe time the Chriſtian Church at *Jeruſalem*, which was of the Circumciſion, was expell'd the City, and diſpers'd into divers Countries, and who publiſh'd his Works, not long after that Diſperſion; I mean *Juſtin Martyr*. From his Dialogue with *Trypho*, I evidently gather'd that there were, even in his time, Men, who blended together the Catholick Faith concerning Chriſt, namely, that he was the Son of God, who exiſted before all Creatures, and in the appointed time was incarnate for the Salvation of Men, and made Man of the Virgin, *&c.* with the Obſervation of the Ritual Law of *Moſes*; but yet did not impoſe the Neceſſity of obſerving this Law upon others, *i. e.* the *Gentile* Chriſtians. To theſe *Juſtin* profeſſes himſelf ready to give the hand of brotherly Charity and Communion. Now I ſay, that theſe were no other than the *Nazareans*, or *Jeruſalem* Chriſtians, who were expell'd their own Country by *Adrian*. What ſays the brazen Author to this? *I anſwer*, ſays he (*b*), *whoever they were, they were not* Nazareans. *Moſt of the* Gnoſticks *acknowledg'd the Pre-exiſtence of Chriſt, and obſerv'd the Law of* Moſes; *Why might they not be* Cerinthians? This is as much as to ſay: Whatſoever you prove, I'll keep cloſe to my Prejudices. I'll forge, or I'll believe any thing rather than that the *Nazareans* own'd Chriſt's Divinity. But here are many Reaſons, why theſe could not be either *Cerinthians*, or any other Sect of the *Gnoſticks*. (1.) Thoſe Chriſtians, ſpoken of by *Juſtin*, confeſs the true Incarnation of the Son of God, which neither the *Cerinthians*, nor any other Sect of the *Gnoſticks own'd* (*c*). Again, the Chriſtians *Juſtin* ſpeaks of, held the Orthodox Faith in all Points neceſſary to

(*a*) *See* Judgment of the Catholick Church, *in the Place cited*, Sect. 14. (*b*) Judgment of the Fathers, p. 44.

(*c*) *See* the Defence of the *Nicene* Creed, Sect. 3. Ch. 1. §. 6. *and the* Judgment of the Catholick Church, Ch. 2. Sect. 4.

Sal-

Salvation, and in nothing dissented from the Catholick Church of Christ, unless that they religiously observed the *Mosaical* Rites. On the other hand, the *Cerinthians* and other *Gnosticks* so adulterated almost all the Christian Religion, that there was scarce one Article of Faith free from their Corruptions. Besides, the *Cerinthians* and other judaizing *Gnosticks*, as well as the *Ebionites*, taught the necessity of observing the *Mosaical* Law. But the Doctrine and Sentiment of *Justin*'s judaizing Christians was quite contrary. Lastly, *Justin* held those *Judaizing* Christians to be Brethren, and hoped well of their Salvation. But it is evident the Holy Man absolutely abhorred the *Cerinthians* and other *Gnosticks* as pestilent Hereticks from the Church of Christ, and Aliens from Salvation by Christ. I am of opinion, our Adversary was asham'd of this silly Answer, and therefore sought another Refuge: *Besides*, says he, *it is uncertain whether* Justin *intended to say that there were some Christians who observed the Law of* Moses, *and yet believed the Pre-existence of Christ before Ages. To draw this Sense from him, Dr.* Bull *is forced to add these Words to his* [the Christ, such a one as you have described just now, *&c.*] Now he who with diligence and attention shall read the entire Context of *Justin*'s Words, will see that I have put no force upon them. *Trypho* had propos'd to *Justin* some Questions concerning the Salvation of good Men, both before and under the ritual Law. *Justin* answers, that both shall be saved in the World to come; and in the Conclusion of his Answer to these Questions, he describes that Faith concerning Christ, which is requisite to the Salvation of a Christian, and says it is, To believe that Christ is the Son of God, who was before *Lucifer* and the Moon, and being made Flesh of a Virgin of the Lineage of *David*, condescended to be born, *&c.* Afterwards immediately follows *Trypho*'s Question, Whether those who believe in Christ, and together with that Belief, retain the Observation of the ritual Law of *Moses*, can be sav'd? Now who

who can doubt but that he means the ſame Faith in Chriſt here, as he had before deſcribed? I have therefore rightly paraphras'd *Trypho*'s Queſtion thus: *But if there be any, who will now live in the Obſervation of the* Moſaical *Law, and believe in this crucified Jeſus, owning him to be that Chriſt of God, (which you have but now deſcribed) can they alſo be ſaved?*

10. Laſtly, I brought an Evidence from the ſixth Book of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, *cap.* 12. intitled, *Againſt thoſe that confeſs, but will Judaize.* Confeſs what? The Faith explain'd in the Chapter immediately going before this, and eſpecially that part of it which is repeated in the end of the Chapter: *We confeſs that Chriſt is not a mere Man; but God the Word, and Man, the Mediator of God and Man.* From this I gather, that in the Age in which the Author of the Conſtitutions liv'd, there were ſome who confeſt Chriſt to be God and Man, and yet did ſo far Judaize, and diſſent from other Chriſtians, as ſtill to adhere to the ritual Law of *Moſes.* Theſe I ſay were the very *Nazareans.* To this the Adverſary anſwers: *Before Dr.* Bull *convinces us of this, it lies upon him to prove, that there were no Chriſtians beſides the* Nazareans, *who obſerv'd the Law of* Moſes, *and believ'd alſo that Chriſt was God the Word*; but he well knew that the *Cerinthians*, and almoſt all the Sects of the *Gnoſticks*, both Judaiz'd and alſo believ'd the pre-exiſtence of our Saviour, and that he was God the Word. He that could write this, diſcovers his own groſs Ignorance of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, or his conſummate Impudence. Neither the *Cerinthians*, nor any other Sect of the *Gnoſticks*, ſincerely acknowledg'd that Chriſt was God the Word and Man, the Mediator of God and Men. See what we have ſaid upon the Teſtimony, cited in the laſt Section from *Juſtin.* Beſides, in the Confeſſion recited *Cap.* 11. and referr'd to in the Title of the 12th *Chap.* there is not one Article which the *Cerinthians*, or any other Sect of the *Gnoſticks* could ſincerely ſubſcribe or acknowledge. In the very beginning

ning of the Confession, the Root of the *Cerinthian* Heresy, and that of all the other *Gnosticks*, is struck at: *We preach one only God, the Lord of the Law and the Prophets, the Maker of the Universe, and the Father of Christ.* To this we have a parallel Place following: *One God the Father of one Son, not more, and thro' Christ of our Paraclete; the Maker of other Orders; one Creator, Maker of the different Creatures by Christ, who also is the Procurator and Lawgiver by him.* Upon this account, the Sophister distrusting this his Answer, quickly goes off from it, and begins a new Question by way of diversion, concerning the Author of the Constitutions, Whether he was a Catholick, or tainted with *Arianism*? I've declar'd my Opinion freely in this Matter *elsewhere (d).* Now as for the Confession of Faith contain'd in the 11th Chapter, the sagacious Reader may easily perceive in it some tincture of *Arianism*, and also something which no *Arian* can truly and sincerely profess. Of this kind is the Author's discretive Profession, That God is the Father of Christ, but the Maker of all other things by Christ. This is more clearly *express'd*, where the Article of the Christian Faith, concerning the only begotten Son of God, is thus explain'd: *And in the Lord Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, begotten, not made; by whom all things were made.* In which words, Christ the Son of God is absolutely excepted out of the Rank of Creatures, and therefore is acknowledg'd to be true God. But grant that the Author in the recited Confession has shewn himself an *Arian*, it will not necessarily follow, that those who confess'd it, mention'd in the Title of the following Chapter, should also be *Arians:* for it is clear, that the Author intended to give us in that Chapter, the entire Rule of Faith, every where receiv'd by the Christian Churches in his days; but it is also clear, that he has given us that Rule by way of Paraphrase, and thrown in his own Explications

(d) *Def. N. C.* Sect. 2. Ch. 3. §. 6.

here

here and there. Now it is manifeſt that he might confeſs that Rule of Faith, who would not admit of all the Author's (or rather Interpolator's) Gloſſes.

11. I return now to what my Adverſary's Digreſſion forced me to leave. It is very plain from what has been before cited from the Antients, that the Chriſtians of the Primitive Church at *Jeruſalem*, who were of the Circumciſion, had receiv'd the genuine Knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *i. e.* had own'd his true Divinity; and that the ſame Faith continued in that Church, till the diſperſion under the Emperor *Adrian*. Now if the Doctrine of our Saviour Chriſt's Divinity was own'd, and always receiv'd in the Church of *Jeruſalem*, the Mother of all other Churches; and was faithfully preſerv'd in it as long as it ſtood: it can't be doubted but that the ſame Faith was propagated and diſpers'd in all the other Churches, which either the Apoſtles themſelves, or their Miniſters founded and conſtituted.

12. Laſtly, it is plain from the Epiſtle of *Pliny Junior*, to *Trajan*, wrote in the Year 106, that the Chriſtians of his times were wont in their Aſſemblies to celebrate the Divinity of our Saviour in Hymns and Pſalms. This he reports from the Confeſſion of apoſtate Chriſtians in theſe words; *Now they affirm'd that this was the Sum of their Crime, or their Error, that they uſually met together upon a ſet day before it was light, and ſung an alternate Hymn to Chriſt, as to God.* An old *grave Author* has appealed to theſe Pſalms againſt the *Artemonites*, who rejected the Tenet of our Lord's true Divinity as novel: *The Pſalms and Songs of the Brethren celebrate Chriſt the Word of God, calling him God.* And theſe Pſalms ſupply'd ſuch clear and evident teſtimony of Chriſt's true Divinity, acknowledged by the Apoſtolical and Primitive Church, that *Paulus Samoſatenus*, the reviver of *Artemon's* Blaſphemy, could not bear them, and therefore commanded the abolition of them in all the Churches under his Government, as the *Antiochian* Fathers, aſſembled againſt him, teſtify in their

their Synodical *Epiſtle.* I doubt not but that the Apoſtle St. *Paul* had an eye to ſome ſuch Hymns in his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, (*e*) where he writes, *Speaking to one another in Pſalms and Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs, ſinging and making melody with your Hearts to the Lord* [*Chriſt.*] By the way, let the Reader obſerve, that the Words *Pliny* uſes concerning the Chriſtians, that they were wont [*dicere ſecum invicem*] to ſing an alternate Hymn to Chriſt, as God, exactly anſwer to St. *Paul's* [λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς] *ſpeaking to one another*, &c. By them the alternate, or reſponſory way of ſinging, as yet frequently uſed in the Churches, ſeems to be ſignified. From what has been ſaid in this Chapter, we have eſtabliſh'd it beyond all Controverſy, that the Tenet of our Lord's Divinity was not the Invention of *Juſtin Martyr*, but obtained in the Chriſtian Churches long before him; yea, was every where delivered and promulged by the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel, together with the Goſpel, of which it makes no ſmall part. *Q. E. D.*

CHAP. II.

That Juſtin *was not deceiv'd by the Frauds of the* Simonians, *and that the Tenet of Chriſt's Divinity did not proceed from the School of* Simon.

HAVING raſed the Foundation, the monſtrous Pile the *Irenicum* has built upon it, falls of itſelf. For whereas it is as evident as poſſible, that *Juſtin* was not the Inventer of the Son's Generation before the World was made; and that that Tenet obtained long before *Juſtin* was born, even in the Apoſtolical Age; it would not be neceſſary carefully to

(*e*) Epheſ. Ch. 5. ver. 19.

examine

examine what led *Juſtin* into this erroneous Sentiment. But becauſe we have determined to follow this Author, ſtep by ſtep, both that his own perverſe Blindneſs may appear the more, and that the Truth may be better illuſtrated; therefore we will freely diſcuſs the ſeveral Cauſes he has pretended. Now theſe Cauſes are either primary, ſuch as did eſpecially lead *Juſtin* into this ſuppos'd Error; or ſecondary, which contributed to his making further Advances in it. The Heretick reckons theſe two of the firſt kind, (1.) The Hereſy of the *Simonians*, and, (2.) The Verſes made in *Orpheus*'s Name by thoſe Hereticks.

2. Of the former he writes thus (*f*): *And firſt it is probable that after the Death of the Apoſtles, as* (*g*) Hegeſippus *ſays, ſome Chriſtians, falſe Chriſts, falſe Prophets, and falſe Apoſtles, deſcended of thoſe ſeven Hereſies among the Chriſtian People* (*h*), *which the ſaid* Hegeſippus *mentions in the ſame place, and whoſe Leader and Chief he makes* Simon Magus *the* Samaritan, (*a Man in his own* Samaritan *turn, not averſe to the mixture of true Worſhip with falſe*) *firſt divided the Unity of the Church with feigned perverſe Doctrine* (*Note*, theſe are the very words of *Hegeſippus*) *againſt God and Chriſt; and* (*as will appear hereafter from the Doctrine of* Simon Magus) *corrupted the ſound Doctrine concerning God and Chriſt, by feigning a new Generation of Chriſt, and introducing a new Chriſt. For all the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians to a Man teſtify of* Simon Magus, *that he was the firſt Oppoſer of Chriſt, the firſt that denied Jeſus to be the Chriſt and Redeemer, ſuch an one as died for our Sins; and on the other hand aſſerted, that he alone was the Son, who appeared among the* Jews, *and the Father who deſcended in* Samaria, *and the Holy Ghoſt who came among the* Gentiles: *That he deſcended, transfigured; that among Men he appeared indeed as Man, tho' he was not Man; that he was ſuppoſed to have ſuffered in* Judea, *tho' he did not ſuffer; that he was the infinite Power; that*

(*f*) Irenicum, p. 14. (*g*) Euſebius, lib. 4. cap. 22. p. 116. (*h*) *Among the* Jewiſh *People, he ſhould have ſaid. See* Valeſius, p. 79, *and* 80, *in* Euſeb.

Selene

Selene *was the firſt Conception of his Mind (for he called the ſecond, the Voice and Comprehenſion of Mind; and the third, Reaſon or Thought) that ſhe was the Mother of all things, by whom in the beginning he had thought to make Angels, and Archangels. For he ſaid, that this Thought or Notion going out from him, and knowing the Mind of her Father, deſcended into the lower Regions, and made Angels and thoſe Powers by which the World was made.* Then he adds, that *Juſtin* was deceived by this dotage of the *Simonians*.

3. But this Conjecture is very far from all probability. For firſt, what has *Chriſt* to do with *Belial*, Light with Darkneſs, and the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, with the moſt notorious Hereticks? It is certain that all the Prelates and Doctors of the Church, who ſucceeded the Apoſtles, (and by conſequence all the Chriſtians, who adher'd to them) always heartily abhor'd the *Simonian* Hereſy; ſo that they would ſooner fetch Fire from Hell, than any Doctrine from his Forge. Their Writings now extant ſufficiently prove this. But that *Juſtin* was eſpecially free from this Blot, is manifeſt, (if from no other place) from that in his Dialogue with *Trypho* (*i*), where having mentioned the *Gnoſticks* under the Title of Nominal Chriſtians, who claimed to themſelves a Liberty of eating things offer'd to Idols, he concludes that in this that Prophecy of Chriſt is fulfilled, in which he foretold that falſe Chriſts, and falſe Apoſtles ſhould ariſe, deceiving many of the Faithful. Moreover, he adds concerning them, *With whom have no Communion, knowing them to be atheiſtical and impious.* In another place he ſays (*k*), that Chriſt foreknew what would happen after his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, that many falſe Prophets, and falſe Chriſts, would come in his Name, (under the Mask of a Chriſtian Profeſſion;) *Which*, ſays he, *is now come to paſs; for there are many who have pretended his Stamp upon atheiſtical, blaſphemous and unjuſt*

(*i*) P. 252. (*k*) P. 308.

Tenets, who have taught, and even now teach those things in the Name of Christ, which were put into their Minds by that impure Spirit the Devil (*l*). Lastly, in his second Apology (*m*), he particularly names *Simon* and other Hereticks, who came out of the School of Christ; he censures and abhors them as the Pests of Christianity. But alas, the Wickedness of our Days! Who would have thought that *Justin*, the most excellent Doctor of the Church, who not only wrote very learned Books against all Heresies, but also seal'd the truly Apostolical Faith with his Blood, should have been suspected as impos'd upon by the worst of Hereticks in a primary Doctrine of Christianity?

4. But secondly, it is so far from true, that the Doctors of the Church took their Opinion of the Son's Divine Generation from the Fictions of the *Simonians*, that it is manifest the Hereticks dress'd up their Fictions (as every Error is the Imitation of some Truth) in the Garb of the Church, (transferring her Doctrine into their Scheme:) The Case is clear. From whence, I beseech you, was that blasphemous Assertion of *Simon*'s, that he only was the Son who appear'd among the *Jews*, the Father who descended in *Samaria*, and

(*l*) P. 69, & 70.

(*m*) *Nay, further in the same Dialogue, he does not only mention the seven Heresies of the* Jews, *spoken of by* Zuicker (*p.* 307.) *but also expresly rejects* Simon Magus *as an Heresiarch, and a false Christian* (*p.* 349.) *in these words:* Neither did I make any account of my own Countrymen, the *Samaritans*, but when I wrote to *Cæsar*, affirm'd that they were led into Error, by giving credit to *Simon Magus* their Countryman, who, they say, is God above all Principality, and Power, and Might. *Here* Justin *has an eye partly to the Place of the Apology cited by the Reverend Author, partly to another, which stands thus in the Apology, commonly call'd the first, p.* 52. And I despis'd my Countryman *Simon*'s impious and erroneous Doctrine. *Moreover, that the Heresy of* Simon *and his Followers was professedly oppos'd by* Justin, *and refuted in writing, he himself informs us in the Apology, commonly entitled the Second, where* (*p.* 70.) *after he has named* Simon, Menander, *and lastly* Marcion, *he adds*, There is also a Piece of mine compos'd against all the Heresies that have been.

the

the Holy Ghost who came upon the *Gentiles?* From whence was it taken, if not from the receiv'd Doctrine of the Church concerning the Holy Trinity, God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit? Where had the same *Simon* that impious Tenet, that Jesus appear'd to Men as Man, tho he was not so; and seem'd to have suffer'd in *Judea*, when he did not suffer; but from the Apostolical Doctrine concerning Christ, as God and Man? For without doubt that Impostor would in vain have taught, that he was not true Man, if the Apostles had taught that he was only mere Man. Lastly, that Exposition of *Cerinthus* (as *Zuicker* calls it) that Christ the Son of God descended into Jesus, when baptized, in the Form of a Dove, from that Principality which is over all, and in him wrought Miracles, and at his Passion flew back again from Jesus into the Heavens to the Father; whence came this Exposition, but from the Apostolical Tradition of a Distinction betwixt the Divine and Human Nature in Christ? Nay, both these Fancies, that of *Simon* concerning the imaginary Body of Christ, and that of *Cerinthus* concerning the Separation of the Son of God from the Man Jesus, seem therefore to have been more pleasing to many, because that venerable Mystery of the Divine and Human Nature in the one Person of Christ, deliver'd by the Apostles, appear'd to them (as it doth to our modern Hereticks) absurd, and contrary to sound Reason. For upon this account they thought it necessary either quite to take away one Nature, or to separate the one from the other. Let my Reader weigh these things attentively, and then, if he is not dull indeed (as *Zuicker* says) he will certainly think as I do.

5. Moreover, the very Words of *Hegesippus*, upon which *Zuicker* lays so great a stress, namely [*That the Hereticks forged perverse Doctrines against God and Christ*] plainly hint that the Doctrine concerning God the Father and his Son, did not come from the School of *Simon*; but, on the contrary, that *Simon* warpt the

Apoſtolical Doctrine to his own wicked Tenets. Obſerve, *Hegeſippus* does not ſay *concerning* God and Chriſt, but *againſt* God and Chriſt. That Magician, in an extraordinary blaſphemous manner, accommodated the Apoſtolical Tradition concerning the Father and the Son to himſelf, his proſtitute *Helena* and other Powers of his own Imagination. For he ſaid (according to (*n*) *Irenæus*) againſt God the Father, that he was the moſt ſublime Power; *i. e.* the Father, who is above all, and ſuffer'd himſelf to be call'd, whatſoever Men call the Father. Then he aſſerted againſt Chriſt, that *Helena*, his firſt ἔννοια, Notion, or Idea, made Angels, and the Powers by whom he ſaid the World was made; that Men were ſaved by his Grace, *&c.*

6. I cannot now but admire how *Hegeſippus* comes to be cited as a Witneſs for the Author of the *Irenicum*, whereas no Antient more plainly ſhews the Vanity and Falſhood of his Conjecture. For he expreſly witneſſeth, that in his Age the Governours of the Church held the Apoſtolical Doctrine pure and entire; for after he had told us what Churches he had been to ſee, and how many Biſhops of the *Roman* Church eſpecially, that moſt eminent Patriarchate he had viſited, he adds: *In every Succeſſion, and in every City, it ſtands ſo, as the Law, and the Prophets, and the Lord teach.* Now when did *Hegeſippus* live? Without doubt he was Contemporary with *Irenæus*, for he expreſly *mentions* Pope *Eleutherus* (in whoſe time *Irenæus* certainly flouriſh'd) as ſucceeding *Soter* in the Epiſcopal See; ſo that *Jerome* muſt be clearly miſtaken in bringing him back to the times of *Adrian*, being deceiv'd, I doubt not, by (*o*) *Euſebius*, who has committed the ſame *Error*, *Book the 4th*, *Chapter the 8th of his Hiſtory:* and afterwards (*p*), as tho correcting his falſe Chronology, places *Hegeſippus* in the times of *Marcus*

(*n*) Lib. 1. Cap. 20. p. 115, & 116. (*o*) Euſeb. E. H. Lib. 4. C. 8. p. 98. Valeſ. Not. (p. 56.) in locum.
(*p*) C. 21. p. 115.

Anto-

Antoninus. How well now has *Zuicker* play'd his game from *Hegesippus*? He asserts that the Doctors of the Church, especially *Justin*, being deceiv'd by the Whimsies of the *Simonians*, chang'd the Apostolical Doctrine. But lo! *Hegesippus* witnesseth, that the Apostolical Doctrine was preserv'd whole and entire by the Doctors in every Church down to his times, (*i. e.* to the times of *Irenæus*) *i. e.* till about thirty Years after *Justin*'s days. Sure this Author would never have appeal'd to *Hegesippus*, if he had been well acquainted with him; doubtless he had form'd a hasty, erroneous Notion of this antient Writer. But this I shall reserve to be proved in the following Chapter.

CHAP. III.

Concerning Hegesippus, *and his Opinion of the Person of Jesus Christ.*

THE Author of the *Irenicum* speaks every where of *Hegesippus* as a Man of his own Sentiments, *i. e.* as an *Ebionite*; one of those who confess our Saviour's Conception of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit, but deny the Pre-existence of God the Word, before Ages. All our present *Socinians* in *England* follow him, and claim this very antient famous Author for their own; they lay this Foundation, and build upon it certain strange Conclusions, which, if true, would be sufficient to overthrow that Apostolical Tradition of the real Divinity of our Lord, which we assert. From these especially, the Author of the *Judgment of the Fathers* (*q*) contends strenuously that *Hegesippus* was certainly an *Ebionite*, and has endeavour'd to confirm it by some shallow Reasonings, which we propose now to examine.

(*q*) Judgment of the Fathers, *&c.* p. 41, 42.

2. *First*, he says, Hegesippus *was a* Jewish *Christian, as* Eusebius *testifies; but all the* Jewish *Christians, according to* Origen, *were* Ebionites; *therefore deny'd the Divinity of our Saviour.* I answer, If by a *Jewish* Christian, the Sophister means a Christian who mix'd the Observation of the Ritual Law of *Moses* with the Faith of Christ, it is absolutely false that *Eusebius* ever wrote that *Hegesippus* was such a one. This is all he says in the Place cited, that *Hegesippus* from his Writings might be concluded to be a Believer of *Hebrew* Extraction. But that he was not such a *Jewish* Christian, as he would make him, we are assur'd from *Hegesippus* himself (*r*), who says, that, as he went to *Rome*, he visited many Christian Churches of the *Gentiles*, and communicated with them, but that when he came thither, he continued very long in the Communion of that famous Church. Hence (*s*) *Eusebius* expressly says, that he flourish'd in the Church, *i. e.* in the same Catholick Church, in which *Irenæus* and others, Men undoubtedly Catholick, flourish'd at the same time, and Men with whom he is join'd. But those Christians of the *Jews*, who, together with the Faith of Christ, retain'd the Observation of the Ritual Law, neither could, nor would live in Communion with any Church of the *Gentiles*. Besides, it is not true that the *Jews*, who received the Faith of Christ, and persevered in the Observation of the *Mosaical* Law, were all *Ebionites*, *i. e.* deny'd the Divinity of Christ; nor does *Origen* say any *such thing* (*t*).

3. Our *Ebionite* proceeds in his Argument thus: *Secondly, the same* Eusebius *in the same place says, that* Hegesippus *used the* Hebrew *Gospel of St.* Matthew, *which was used by the* Ebionite *and* Unitarian *Christians only.* I answer: *Eusebius* indeed says, that *Hegesippus* cited some things out of the Gospel of the *Hebrews*; but he does not say that he used that Gospel, as the

(*r*) Lib. 4. Cap. 22. p. 116. (*s*) Lib. 4. C. 21. p. 115.
(*t*) Judgment of the Catholick Church, C. 2. Sect. 18.

Ebionites

Ebionites used it, *i. e.* deem'd it Canonical. Now if to cite some things from the Gospel to the *Hebrews*, is a sure Token of an *Ebionite*, then very many Authors may be esteem'd *Ebionites*, who, of our certain knowledge, are Catholicks, and abhorred that Heresy entirely. Then *Jerome*, that strenuous Assertor of the Son's Consubstantiality, was an *Ebionite*. For he often cites that Gospel, and translated it, as he himself testifies, into the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues. Upon this account *Julian* the *Pelagian* (*u*) accuses *Jerome* for using a Testimony out of the fifth Gospel, which he himself had translated into *Latin*. Then (*x*) *Origen* was an *Ebionite*, tho he rejected the *Ebionites* of both Sorts as Hereticks, and Aliens from the Church of Christ. For *Jerome* says, that *Origen* very often used the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*. Besides, *Papias*, as *Irenæus* (*y*) says, a Disciple of St. *John*'s, and a Companion of *Polycarp*'s, hath given us a pretty long Account of the Discourse betwixt our Saviour, and the Woman taken in Adultery, which was only to be found in the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*, as *Eusebius* (*z*) tells us. Now all the antient Catholick Authors that have mention'd *Papias*, however of mean Abilities, and erroneous in some Points, testify that he was a Catholick, and constantly maintain'd the Rule of Faith. Lastly, to mention no more, the blessed *Ignatius*, an excellent Defender of the great Mystery of Godliness concerning God incarnate, against the Hereticks of his days, has some things in his Epistle to the *Smyrnæans*, which (*a*) *Eusebius* confesses he cannot trace. *In the Epistle to the* Smyrnæans, says he, *speaking of our Saviour Christ, he recites some words, which I can't tell where to find: But I know and believe*, says he, *that our Lord appear'd in the Flesh after his Resurrection, and when he was come to* Peter *and his other Companions,*

(*u*) Catalogus Script. Eccles. in Jacobo, Fratre Domini.
(*x*) Contra Cels. Lib. 5. p. 272. (*y*) Lib. 5. Cap. 33. p. 498. (*z*) Lib. 3. Cap. 39. p. 91.
(*a*) Lib. 3. Cap. 36. p. 86, & 87.

ſaid to them, Lay hold of me, handle me, and ſee that I am not an incorporeal Spirit. *And immediately they handling him, believed.* Now this is taken from the Goſpel to the *Hebrews*, as (*b*) *Jerome* has acquainted us, tho (*c*) *Euſebius* knew nothing of it.

4. His third Argument is thus contracted by himſelf: Hegeſippus *giving a Catalogue of the Hereticks, who were either of the* Jews *or* Gentiles, *makes no mention of the* Cerinthians *or* Ebionites *in it, which, without doubt, he would have done, if he had believed the Preexiſtence and Divinity of our Saviour.* It is intolerable to ſee a Man trifle in Matters ſerious, and of great importance. For, 1. Does he really believe that *Hegeſippus* in the Place cited (*d*), intended to give a full and compleat Catalogue of all the Hereticks, who diſturbed the Church in his time, or who were by him thought to be Hereticks? If ſo, he knew nothing of *Irenæus*'s Hereſiology, who was Contemporary with *Hegeſippus*. 2. Does he ſeriouſly believe that *Hegeſippus* did not think the *Cerinthians* were Hereticks? Then he who has preſumed to give us the Judgment of the Fathers, is as ignorant as can be of *Cerinthus*'s Tenets, and a perfect Stranger in the Writings of the Antients. *Cerinthus* taught, beſides his Error in common with *Ebion* concerning Chriſt's mere Humanity, other abſurd and impious Tenets. For he affirm'd, as we ſaid before, that this viſible World was not made by the ſupreme God, but by inferior Powers, or Angels that did not know that God; That the Angel, who gave the Law by *Moſes* to the *Iſraelites*, was an evil Angel, *&c.* Yea, (*e*) *Epiphanius* ſays, that he defended almoſt all the ſhocking Errors of *Carpocrates*, and in this only differ'd from that Monſter, that he obſerv'd the *Moſaical* Rites, not cordially, but for convenience ſake, to curry favour with the *Jews*, and eſcape their *Perſecutions* (*f*). What ſay you now?

(*b*) Hieronym. in Ignatio. (*c*) Euſeb. ibidem.
(*d*) Lib. 4. Cap. 22. p. 115, 116. (*e*) Hæreſ. 28.
(*f*) Defence of the *Nicene* Creed, Sect. 3. Ch. 1. S. 7.

Did

Did not *Hegesippus* account such a Prodigy of a Man a Heretick? Lastly, by this very Argument it may as well be proved, that *Justin Martyr* was an *Ebionite*, or an *Unitarian*, that is, deny'd the Pre-existence and Divinity of our Saviour. For *Justin*, in his Disputation with *Trypho*, reckons up as many *Jewish* Heresies as *Hegesippus*, namely seven, tho he calls them by different Names (*g*). These are his words: *Neither can any one, that rightly considers the Matter, call the* Sadducees Jews, *or such Hereticks, as the* Genists, *the* Merists, Galileans, Hellenians, *the* Pharisees *and* Baptists. Here the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites* are omitted. He particularly reckons up some Hereticks which rose among the Christians, in another (*h*) Place of the same Dialogue; namely, *Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians*, and *Saturnilians*. Here again no mention is made of the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites*. Hence some Person may argue thus: *Justin* giving an account of the Hereticks, *Jewish* and Christian, does not reckon the *Cerinthians* and *Ebionites* among them, which, without doubt, he would have done, if he had believed the Pre-existence and Divinity of our Saviour. Yet who is there that does not know that *Justin* not only believed it himself, but also vehemently and strenuously defended it against both the *Jews* and *Judaizing* Christians. You'll say that *Justin* names some Christian Hereticks, and adds [*with others of other Names.*] I own it. And does not *Hegesippus* the same? Yes indeed. For after he has named some Christian Hereticks, he adds immediately: *And from these* [have sprung] *false Christs, false Prophets, false Apostles, who have broke the Unity of the Church by pernicious Words against God and Christ.* In which words are certainly comprehended all the Hereticks, who rose after the aforenamed, and from them.

5. This is the last of our Sophister's Arguments: *Valesius*, says he, *confesses that* Hegesippus's *Ecclesiastical*

(*g*) Justin, p. 307. (*h*) P. 253.

History

Hiſtory was neglected by the Antients, and therefore periſh'd, becauſe it was found too greatly to favour the Unitarians. It is abſolutely falſe that ever *Valeſius* confeſs'd this: He only ſays this in general (*i*), That the Writings of *Hegeſippus* and other Antients were neglected, and ſo periſh'd upon account of the Errors with which they abounded. Theſe are his words, *Being neglected upon account of the Errors with which they* (Clement's Hypotypoſes) *abounded, at length they were loſt. The ſame reaſon, I judge, may be given for the loſs of* Papias, Hegeſippus, *and other Antients.* As for *Hegeſippus*, I know not what Errors of his *Valeſius* intends or ſuſpects. For the antient Catholick Authors that had read his Works, (Men we muſt believe rather than *Valeſius*), commended them (as we ſhall ſee hereafter) for orthodox, uſeful, and worth reading. Thus much (by way of Examination) for the Sophiſter's petty Reaſonings. We ſhall now do them the further honour, light and trifling as they are, to oppoſe to them the Teſtimonies of the Antients for *Hegeſippus*, who reckon'd him among the Catholicks, even among the greateſt Ornaments of the primitive Catholick Church.

6. Firſt then, *Euſebius*, who was oblig'd to his Collections, and tranſcribed very many things out of the Commentaries of *Hegeſippus* into his Hiſtory, makes honourable mention of him every where, and often, in an extraordinary and eſpecial manner, commends his Orthodoxy. Now if *Hegeſippus* had been an *Ebionite*, *Euſebius* would never have done ſo; for he held even thoſe *Ebionites*, who acknowledg'd the Conception of Chriſt of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit, but deny'd that he pre-exiſted as God the Word and Wiſdom before Ages, for impious Hereticks, as I have ſhewn *elſewhere* (*k*). Nay, he extols him as a brave Champion of the Catholick Faith againſt the Hereticks of his time. A glorious Champion indeed, and a

(*i*) *Annot. in* Euſeb. *p.* 85.
(*k*) *Judgment of the Catholick Church*, Chap. 2. Sect. 11.

He-

Heretick himſelf! Hear *Euſebius* (*l*): *In thoſe times again the Truth had many Defenders, who contended for her not only in Words, but in written Controverſy againſt the impious Hereſies. Among theſe,* Hegeſippus *was famous, an Author we have made great uſe of in our former Books, having been oblig'd to his credit and report for what was done in the Apoſtolical Times. He has given us Memoirs of the Apoſtolical Preaching in five Books, written with good Credit, and great Simplicity.* There is another place parallel to this (*m*): *In the ſame times,* Hegeſippus, *whom we have mention'd in the former Books, flouriſh'd in the Church; and* Dionyſius *Biſhop of* Corinth, *and* Pinytus *of* Crete, *beſides* Philip *and* Apollinaris, *and* Melito, *and laſtly* Irenæus, *all whoſe Orthodox Writings are come to our hands, and give us apoſtolical Tradition, and ſound Faith.* But in the beginning of the following Chapter (*n*), he again adds: Hegeſippus *indeed, in the five Books of Commentaries, which are come down to us, hath left us the moſt ample Teſtimony of his Faith.*

7. What has our Adverſary now to oppoſe to theſe plain Teſtimonies of *Euſebius?* After he has produc'd the Arguments, by which he would prove *Hegeſippus* an Unitarian, he immediately adds: *If it be objected, Did* Euſebius *know nothing of this, for he every where makes honourable mention of* Hegeſippus? *I anſwer, he knew it very well, but he durſt not tell it; it was not for* Euſebius *to reprove an Apoſtolical Father; it was only for him to diſſemble what the* Unitarians, *and eſpecially his own Adverſary* Marcellus, *would not have neglected to uſe in Defence of their Cauſe.* Who in his Senſes is not amaz'd at this Anſwer? Sure, if *Hegeſippus* had been an *Ebionite*, and *Euſebius* knew it, he not only did amiſs in diſſembling it, but alſo told a direct lye; for he not only does not ſay that he was an *Ebionite*, but he expreſly ſays the contrary, namely, that he was entirely Catholick, and had given us the Apoſtical Doctrine

(*l*) Lib. 4. Cap. 7, *and* 8. p. 98. (*m*) Cap. 21, p. 115.
(*n*) Cap. 22.

and

and Tradition clear and ſincere in his Writings. Nay, he has told a moſt impudent Falſhood; for the Commentaries of *Hegeſippus* were not read by *Euſebius* only, but were common, at leaſt among the Learned; as being greatly celebrated both for the venerable Antiquity of their Author, and the very uſeful Matter of which they treated, namely, what happen'd in the days of the Apoſtles, and the firſt Succeſſion after them; and upon theſe accounts, very agreeable to all Lovers of Antiquity. *Euſebius* could not ſafely lye in this Matter, becauſe he might eaſily be convicted of the moſt manifeſt Falſhood; and the Fraud being diſcover'd, would have expos'd himſelf to the hatred of all Lovers of Truth. Again, it is very ridiculous to ſay, *Euſebius* durſt not reprove *Hegeſippus*, becauſe he was an apoſtolical Father; for, if *Hegeſippus* had indeed been an *Ebionite*, he cou'd not have paſs'd for an apoſtolical Father with the Catholick Church, to which it was *Euſebius*'s Intereſt to recommend himſelf. Laſtly, *Euſebius* wou'd have offended both the Catholicks and Hereticks by this Lye of his; the Catholicks by commending an Heretick ſo greatly, and the Hereticks, by depriving them of ſo great an Advocate, and pretending he was of the other Side. I am aſham'd to dwell ſo long upon ſuch manifeſt Trifles. To proceed therefore:

8. Not only *Euſebius*, but other antient Catholick Writers, have given teſtimony that *Hegeſippus* was Orthodox. Thus * *Jerome* not only praiſes him for the great Sanctity of his Life, but alſo recommends his Writings (which he had read) as containing very uſeful Things. For in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers he thus ſpeaks of *Hegeſippus*: 'He liv'd near the 'Apoſtles days, and has put together all that was done 'in the Church from our Lord's Paſſion, till his own 'Times, and hath collected from ſeveral Places many 'uſeful Things. His Work is made up of five Books

* Catalogus Script. Eccleſ. in Hegeſippo.

'in

'in a plain Style, as tho' he had ſtudy'd to expreſs 'their Lives, whom he imitated in the manner of his 'writing.' Now if *Jerome* had found any Tares of Hereſy in the Works of *Hegeſippus*, mix'd with the good Grain of pure Doctrine, without doubt he wou'd have caution'd his Reader againſt them; if he had diſcover'd that he was an *Ebionite*, he would never have ſuffer'd him to paſs without Note or Cenſure, much leſs would he have honour'd him with ſuch Commendations; for no Man was more bitter againſt the Hereſy which deny'd our Saviour to be God, than *Jerome*. *Gobarus* alſo (*o*) ſays of *Hegeſippus*, *That he was an antient Apoſtolical Man*; Antient with reſpect to the Age in which he liv'd; and Apoſtolical, for the Holineſs and Purity of his Life and Doctrine.

9. Let us now hear *Hegeſippus* ſpeak for himſelf. He ſays in that very Chapter (*p*), from which the Sophiſter would prove him an *Ebionite*, that he, *in his journey to* Rome, *waited upon many Biſhops, and from all of them heard one and the ſame Doctrine.* Then he adds, *And the Church of* Corinth *perſever'd in the right Faith till the times of* Primus *their Biſhop, with whom I convers'd familiarly in my Voyage to* Rome, *and ſtay'd with the* Corinthians *many days, both of us being greatly comforted by the right Faith of each other. But when I was come to* Rome, *I abode there with* Anicetus, *to whom* Eleutherus *was then Deacon.* Then he ſubjoins; *Now the ſame things, which were preach'd by the Law, the Prophets, and the Lord himſelf, ſtill remain in the ſeveral Succeſſions of Biſhops, and in the ſeveral Cities.* *Hegeſippus* then approv'd the Doctrine of the Catholick Church of his time, as true and entirely agreeable to the Scripture of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, and to Primitive and Apoſtolical Tradition. Now what the Doctrine of the Catholick Church was in the days of *Hegeſippus*, you may very well inform yourſelf from his Contemporary *Irenæus* (*q*). I'll only cite two Places of the many

(*o*) Photius, Cod. 232. p. 892. (*p*) Euſeb. Lib. 4. cap. 22. (*q*) Lib. 1. cap. 19. p. 114.

which

which occur in him. He thus describes the Rule of Truth every where receiv'd in the Catholick Church in his time: *As we understand (or hold) the Rule of Truth, this is it, That there is one God Almighty, who created all things by his Word, who dispos'd, and brought them all into existence out of nothing, as the Scripture saith: By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth.* And again, *All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made (but out of all, nothing is excepted; the Father made all things, whether visible or invisible, sensible or intellectual, temporal for some certain end or purpose, or eternal) and he made all these things, not by Angels, nor by any Powers of another Will and Purpose from him; for God wants nothing: but by his Word and Spirit he makes all things, he disposes, he governs, he gives them existence.* Cou'd any *Ebionite* approve this Confession of Faith? The other place you have in the third Book, Chap. 3. in the very beginning (*r*), collated with Chap. 4. of the same Book. In the former place he thus writes concerning the Tradition of the Catholick Church: *All Persons who will see the truth then, may find in every Church the Tradition of the Apostles manifested throughout the World; and we can reckon up those who were made Bishops by the Apostles, and their Successors, down to our own times, who neither taught, nor knew any such thing as these Men dream of.* Here he speaks of universal Tradition manifested in the whole World, and in every Church (that is, as *Hegesippus* says, in the several Successions of Bishops, and in the several Cities) and so manifested, that every one who was a lover of Truth, and would not shut his Eyes against it, might see it. Now what this universal, this manifest Tradition was, in the Chapter immediately following, he thus clearly explains: *But what if the Apostles had not left us the Scriptures, must we not have follow'd the Order of Tradition, which they delivered to those to whom they committed the Care of the Churches? The Order to which*

(*r*) P. 232. p. 242.

many

many Nations of the Barbarians, *or rude ignorant People, who believe in Chriſt, give their aſſent; who have the Rule of Salvation written in their Hearts by the Spirit, without Ink and Paper, and carefully preſerve the old Tradition, believing in one God the Maker of Heaven, and Earth, and all things therein by his Son Jeſus Chriſt; who out of his very great Love to his own Creation, condeſcended to be born of a Virgin, by himſelf uniting Man to God.*

10. From theſe things it is very clear that *Hegeſippus* was entirely Catholick, and believ'd as the Catholick Church of his days did, in the Son of God, who exiſted before all Ages, by whom all things were made, and who at the appointed time was himſelf made Man for us. Very vain therefore are all thoſe Concluſions, which our *Unitarians* have drawn from the contrary *Hypotheſis*; namely, that *Hegeſippus* was an *Ebionite*. Hear now the Author of the *Judgment of the Fathers, &c.* thus arguing from that Hypotheſis (*s*): *If* Hegeſippus (*the* Unitarian Hegeſippus) *was the Author* Euſebius *follows in his account of the fifteen Biſhops of* Jeruſalem, *that they profeſs'd the true Knowledge of Chriſt (of which no Man who is acquainted with his Writings can doubt) then we have gain'd a point of the greateſt advantage; namely, that not only the* Jewiſh *Chriſtians, but alſo the Church of* Rome, *and all the more famous Churches, which* Hegeſippus *has viſited in order to know their Doctrine and Diſcipline, thought as the* Unitarians *did; that is, as* Hegeſippus *did; that is, that our Lord Chriſt was only Man. For he ſays (t), that he went to* Rome, *and lived there under the Popes* Anicetus, Soter, *and* Eleutherus; *and that the Doctrines taught by the Law, the Prophets, and our Saviour himſelf, were preſerved there, and in all other Biſhopricks. In a word, he confeſſes, that he found the Churches Uniform and Orthodox. Now this, if* Hegeſippus *was a* Unitarian (*as I think I have proved*) *can mean nothing elſe, than that the*

(*s*) P. 42, and 43. (*t*) Euſeb. ſupra cit.

Churches

Churches believed, as the Jewiſh *Chriſtians did, that our Lord Chriſt was a Man, a Prophet, an Embaſſador of God, upon whom the Logos or Word of God reſted. This is entirely agreeable to what the antient* Unitarians, *(the* Artemonites*) affirmed in* Euſebius; *namely, that they had preſerved the Doctrine delivered by the Apoſtles till* Victor *and* Zepherinus *oppoſed it, who ſucceeded* Eleutherus, *as he did* Soter, *and* Soter Anicetus, *the antient Popes, with whom* Hegeſippus *convers'd.* Theſe Concluſions, which the Sophiſter infers from his own Hypotheſis concerning the Faith and Opinion of *Hegeſippus*, are ſo abſurd, and ſo manifeſtly repugnant to the moſt Authentick Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that any Man who has a grain of Candour and Judgment, muſt think the Hypotheſis to be, what it really is, abominably falſe.

11. This notwithſtanding, the Author of a Book entitled, *The true and antient Faith concerning the Divinity of our Lord aſſerted againſt Dr.* Bull's *Judgment of the Church*, &c. has run the ſame lengths with this Writer. For he writes thus (*u*), *But I muſt intreat my Reader to obſerve, that all the Books of the Diſciples of the Apoſtles, who did not run into* Platoniſm, *are loſt. Now among others, either by chance loſt, or on purpoſe deſtroy'd, we lament the Books wrote by the Chriſtians of the Circumciſion: of them, one* Hegeſippus *a very famous Writer had compiled the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the moſt early Times; but the Errors which the* Platonizing *Chriſtians have charged upon him, have occaſioned the loſs of his valuable Hiſtory.* Valeſius *is of my opinion, and makes this Obſervation upon* Euſebius (*x*): Which Books *(the Hypotypoſes of* Clement Alex.) were neglected and loſt becauſe of the Errors with which they abounded. I judge that the ſame thing was alſo the occaſion of our loſing the Books of *Papias*, *Hegeſippus*, and other Antients. *In this number he reckons* Hegeſippus's *Hiſtory: What were the Errors of it, is not difficult to conjecture;*

(*u*) P. 178, 179, 180. (*x*) Lib. 5. cap. 11.

for-

for as much as all the Christians, such as they are, that formerly were, or now are Platonists, *call every thing an Error, which doth not suite with their Hypothesis concerning God the Word, begotten not made.* Hegesippus *was a* Jew *by Nation, and one of those whom the* Pagan *Proselytes strenuously endeavour'd to oppress, for the support of the Error concerning the Pre-existence. Nor is it to be doubted whether the Errors, of which he was accused, were the same as the Christian* Nazarenes *held; whether by the Virgin Church, of which he speaks in* Eusebius, *he understood that of the Circumcision, which stood off the fartheſt from* Platonism; *and whether by the Seduction of Error, which arose under the Emperors* Trajan, *or* Adrian, *he intended the Philosophy of* Plato *then introduced into the Church; a Philosophy of a direct tendency to debase Christianity, foully to change, and thereby almost destroy it: This the Apostles themselves foretold, and it is so true and manifest in itself, that I find* Valesius *himself noting upon the place of* Eusebius *aforecited (y), that the Father had understood the Words of* Hegesippus *in too large a sense; and accommodated that to the whole Catholick Church, which he only said concerning the Virginity of the Church of* Jerusalem.

This is a matter of great Importance, and worthy Observation. By it Hegesippus *sets out the fatal time, when the Christian Bishops, formerly Heathen Philosophers, succeeded the* Nazarene *Bishops; and consequently when* Platonism *justled out the pure and simple Truth, which the Successors of St.* James *had preach'd. Now this happened in the Reign of* Adrian, *when all the* Jews *and uncircumcised Christians were expelled* Jerusalem. Sulpitius Severus *had reason for what he said, that the Christian Faith,* i. e. *the* Platonical *Faith, (according to his Notion) had considerable Advantage from that Dispersion; for then the fatal Evil spread itself greatly, when the Primitive Faith which the* Nazarenes *had preserved in its Purity, could no longer bear up against* Platonism. And a little after this, is the very thing of which the *Artemonites*

(y) *Annot. in* Euseb. p. 49.

complain in *Eusebius: That all the Antients, and even the Apostles themselves, receiv'd and taught what they now do; and that the Truth of the Gospel was preserv'd till the times of* Victor, *who was the 13th Bishop of* Rome *from* Peter; *but that from the times of* Zephirinus, *who succeeded* Victor, *the Truth had been adulterated.* But this Author has one thing peculiar to himself, namely, the unskilful or the impudent Use he makes of *Sulpitius Severus*'s Authority for the support of his Dreams. *Sulpitius Severus*, says he, *affirms, that the Christian Faith, that is, according to his Notion, the* Platonical, *had considerable advantage from that Dispersion (of the Christians of the Circumcision under* Adrian) *for then the fatal Evil spread itself, when the Primitive Faith, which the* Nazarenes *had preserv'd in its Purity, could no longer bear up against* Platonism. Now *Sulpitius* expressly saith in this place, that the Christians of *Jerusalem*, who were of the Circumcision, before the Dispersion under *Adrian*, believ'd Christ to be God. Nor does he speak less clearly, that the Advantage which the Christian Faith had from that Dispersion, consisted in this, *That it was the Occasion of setting the Liberty of the Faith and the Church free from the Servitude of the Law.* He did not so much as dream that it had been an inlet to *Platonism.*

12. But no Man can wonder at these Follies in this Author, who has observ'd what Paradoxes he has ventur'd to publish and defend openly in the Christian World. Thus, (z) *When therefore the primitive Christians spoke of Christ, as far superior to mere Man, or as the pre-existent Word, which was with God from the beginning, they plainly meant that Holy Spirit, that Divine Power, which created the World, and form'd the Body of* Jesus Christ, *which inhabited it when form'd, and had it as the Temple, from which he would give out his Oracles publickly. This was the true and genuine Opinion concerning the Article in Controversy, which indeed afterwards began to be*

(z) Pag. 152, 153.

chang'd

chang'd somewhat, because the Disciples of these Men, prejudiced to a Platonical *Trinity, distinguish'd between the Word and the Spirit, and by an idle* Platonical *Subtilty, made the Synonimous Words into two different things.* He eagerly contends that this was the genuine Opinion of *Ignatius, Irenæus,* and other very antient Fathers; and every where in his Book affirms, that according to the Scriptures and the Primitive Fathers, the greatest Excellency of our Saviour, and that for which he is celebrated as God, is not, that he existed before all Ages, or that all things were made by him; but this only, that he was wonderfully conceiv'd of a Virgin by the Holy Spirit, whereas he had no Existence before. Now he that after reading the Fathers can affirm these things, must either have no Conscience, or no Reason and Judgment at all. For, (1.) It is very certain that the Primitve Fathers, by the *Word,* which was before the Creation, and by which the World was made, did not understand a certain Power, which had no proper Person, but a *living and subsisting Word,* which we commonly call *a Person.* (2.) It is equally certain, that those Primitive Fathers took the *Word* to be a Person distinct from God the Father, and the Holy Spirit. (3.) Lastly, it is evident that they did not determine the greatest Dignity and Excellence of our Saviour's Person to consist in his wonderful Conception of the Virgin by the Holy Spirit; but on the contrary, that his Nativity of the Virgin did entirely belong to his stupendous Condescension, and to that Dispensation, which he, of his infinite Mercy and Goodness to Mankind, was pleas'd to take upon him. All who love the Truth, and are moderately vers'd in the Primitive Antiquity, know this to be the true and the *antient Faith of the Church* (*a*).

13. But to return from these Triflers to the Holy Fathers, *Hegesippus* and *Irenæus,* two very sufficient Evidences of the Primitive Apostolical Tradition. As

(*a*) *See the Judgment of the Catholick Church,* c. 5. n. 5, & 9.

for *Hegesippus*, he was near the Apostolical Age, and wrote the History of the Church from the Passion of our Lord, down to his own times. In order to compleat this History, no doubt but that he consulted very many Records of the Apostolical Age, and the next Succession to it. Besides, as *Jerome* says, he was an Admirer of the Primitive Piety, a Man of holy Simplicity, and very great Sanctity, and therefore an Historian very well worthy to be believ'd. This same *Hegesippus* witnesseth, That the Doctrine at first delivered by Christ and the Apostles in all Churches, in his time (in which it is plain, the Tenet of Christ's divine and human Nature was every were receiv'd in the Catholick Church) remain'd pure and intire. *Irenæus* testifies the same, who was Contemporary with *Hegesippus*, and, as *Tertullian* thought, a very curious Examiner of all Doctrines, and who had, besides this, a very singular advantage from the divine Providence, of conversing with the (*b*) Blessed *Polycarp*, a Disciple of St. *John*, was thoroughly instructed in his Doctrine, and perfectly remembred it, as he himself says in his Epistle to *Florinus* (*c*). He appeals to him as an Evidence of the antient Tradition abovemention'd, namely, *of the Faith in one God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things therein, by the Son of God Jesus Christ; who of his very great affection towards his own Creature, condescended to be born of the Virgin, uniting in himself Man to God.* Nay, he appeals to the *Asian* Churches and Bishops, the Successors of *Polycarp*, as Witnesses of the same Tradition. For he writes thus: Polycarp *also, who was not only instructed by the Apostles, and convers'd with many of them, but was also made Bishop of the Church of* Smyrna, *by the Apostles, in* Asia, *whom we have seen in our youth, (for he liv'd a great while, and being very old, departed this Life a Glorious Martyr) always taught us those things which he had learnt of the Apostles, which he also deliver'd to the Church, and*

(*b*) Euseb. *E. H.* p. 152. (*c*) Lib. 3. cap. 3. p. 233.

which

which are only true. All the Churches in Asia, *and they who succeeded* Polycarp *down to this day, give testimony to these things.* Surely then those who are not ashamed to oppose this stupid Falshood of the *Artemonites*, Hereticks of a later date, to such creditable Evidence, are very impudent indeed. Let us now proceed to examine the rest of *Zuicker*'s Whims.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Orphic Verses, *and, by way of Digression, of the* Sybilline Oracles, *alledg'd by* Justin *and other Antients against the Heathens.*

1. LET us now in the second place examine *Zuicker*'s wild Conjecture upon the *Orphic* Verses. He writes thus (*d*): *These Dreams, Fictions, and Prodigies of* Simon Magus, *with the additional Exposition of* Cerinthus, *concerning which I shall discourse a little after, seem altogether to have been the first Draught and the Elements of* Orpheus*'s Verses (a Heathen, and, as* Pausanias *says, a Magician also) cited by* Justin Martyr *in his Exhortation to the* Greeks, (*which run thus:* I adjure thee by the Word of the Father, which he first brought forth out of his Mouth, when by his advice he made the Universe.) *These Verses, some Impostor, a Disciple of* Simon Magus, *seems to have propagated among the Christians under the Name of* Orpheus, *a Name so famous* (*as* Suidas *reports*) *in the most antient times, that very many Writings of other Authors, were said to be his genuine Works, to gain them the greater Credit. These* Justin *made sacred to himself and others, and pretended they were deriv'd from the Doctrine of* Moses *by* Orpheus.

(*d*) Iren. p. 15, 16.

Afterwards he adds: *That* Justin *depending upon these Verses, and others, propos'd their Opinion concerning the Generation of Christ, or the Mind, Word, or Reason of the Father, from the Father, that the World might be made by him, that he might come down to Men, and at length be made one of them.* The Heretick depends upon these two Supports: (1.) That those Verses under the Name of *Orpheus*, were forg'd by the *Simonians*. (2.) That *Justin* relying upon those Verses, had propos'd his Opinion concerning the Generation of the Word before the World was made.

2. As for the former, 'tis *gratis dictum*, nor can he produce the least appearance of an Argument for it. Nay, there are plain Reasons to the contrary. For first, *Justin* cites those Verses, as well known before, and formerly cited among the Heathen under the Name of *Orpheus*; it is therefore scarce probable that they should be forg'd by Hereticks of late date, obscure, and but little known to the Heathens. Thus *Justin* (*e*) introduces his Citation of these Verses: *For I don't suppose any of you, who read diligently the Histories of* Diodorus *and others, who have committed these things to writing, are ignorant that* Orpheus, *and* Homer, *and* Solon *the* Athenian *Lawgiver, and* Plato, *and* Pythagoras, *and some others who went to* Ægypt, *and were assisted by the Books of* Moses, *afterward taught quite contrary to their former false Sentiments of the Gods.*

3. In these Words, if I'm not mistaken, *Justin* hints to us the Original of the *Orphick Verses*, namely, that some very antient Person, who understood the Learning of *Moses*, and the *Jewish* Religion had formerly wrote those Verses under the Name of *Orpheus*, (for I can't believe as *Justin* does, that *Orpheus* himself was the Author of them) and that they were famous among the *Gentiles* as the Verses of the celebrated Poet *Orpheus*, some Ages before *Justin* was born. I judge, *I say*, that it is very probable the *Orphic*

(*e*) Pag. 15.

Verses

Verses came from the *Jewish* Learning. That Man must be greatly wanting both in Prudence and Modesty, who will deny that the Heathen Writers borrow'd many things from the Books of *Moses* and the *Hebrews*. The undoubted Writings of the Heathens, which speak of the one God, the Creation of the World, *&c.* things scarcely, if at all to be had from any other Quarter, sufficiently testify this. Now the *Jewish* Religion then began to be the best known to the Pagans, when that People was first expell'd their own Country, and dispers'd every where among the Heathen: afterwards the very Scriptures (God's singular Providence thus making way for the calling of the *Gentiles*) were translated in *Alexandria* by the Seventy, at the command of *Ptolemy*, into a Tongue common to almost all the Heathen, I mean *Greek*. From that time, who can wonder that there are some things in the Heathen Writings, which agree with the *Jewish* Learning?

4. But you'll say, how cou'd they be accommodated to the *Orphic Verses*, when in them there is mention of the *Logos*, or *Word*, by which all things were made, but which was not known to the *Jews* themselves? I answer, it is clear from the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, which calls that, by which God makes and prescribes all things, the *Word*; that the *Word* of God was very well known to the *Jews*. Many learned Men have enlarg'd upon this Matter. Among others, consult *Hugo Grotius* upon St. *John's* first and second Chapters of his Gospel. There also he conjectures, that the Writer of the *Orphic Verses* borrow'd his Notion of the *Word* from the *Hebrews*; that *Heraclitus* follow'd him (*Amelius* has observ'd, that he used the Word in that Sense) and that *Plato* and the *Platonics* follow'd *Heraclitus*. But the late very learned Dr. *Allix* has exhausted this Subject, in his Book intitled, *The Judgment of the antient* Jewish *Church against the Unitarians*.

5. I will give my Opinion by the bye, that the *Sibylline Oracles* alſo produc'd againſt the Heathens by *Juſtin*, and after him by others, might proceed from the ſame Original. For I can't be brought to believe that thoſe Prophecies were either forg'd by the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and in the way of Pious Frauds obtruded by them, as ſome learned Men confidently aſſert, raſhly and impudently (as Biſhop *Montague* ſays) throwing the greateſt Reflection upon thoſe Holy Prelates. For what Argument do they bring for the Support of ſo ſtrange an Aſſertion? Nothing but mere, vain, trifling Surmiſes. On the other hand, the Reaſons on our ſide are clear. (1.) Who can believe that *Juſtin* and the other Fathers (pious and prudent Men) would preſume to alledge the ſpurious and ſuppoſititious Verſes of the *Sibyls* before the Emperors, before the Heathens (to whom they could not but be very well known) in defence of their Faith; appealing with the greateſt Aſſurance to the Copies, which were in the hands of the Heathens. Nay, *Juſtin* near the end of his Exhortation appeals to thoſe *Sibylline Oracles*, as notorious to the whole World. Theſe are his Words, (*f*) *Be convinc'd by the moſt antient* Sibyl, *whoſe Books are preſerv'd every where*, &c. I know indeed that the Heathens objected to the Chriſtians the inſertion of many Things in the *Sibylline Verſes*. This *Celſus* alledg'd, as we learn from *Origen* (*g*.) But notwithſtanding, I alſo know what *Origen* anſwers in the ſame place, That he had not ſhewn what thoſe Inſertions were; tho' no doubt, he would have done it, if he had had more antient and incorrupt Copies. And indeed if that Fraud of the Chriſtians cou'd have been detected in the Times of *Celſus*; *Theophilus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *&c.* had been the moſt fooliſh, impudent Mortals imaginable, to have alledg'd them with aſſurance againſt the Heathens afterwards.

(*f*) Pag. 36. (*g*) Pag. 369. Lib. 7.

6. Be-

6. Beſides, we have ſome things in the Heathen Writers, who liv'd either before our Lord's Birth, or when he was upon Earth, taken from thoſe *Sibylline* Books, exactly agreeing with what the Fathers cited from them. *Juſtin Martyr* cites the *Sibyls*, foretelling the Conflagration of the World, in theſe Words (*h*); *The* Sibyl *and* Hyſtaſpis *have ſaid, that there would be a conſumption of all corruptible things by Fire.* The ſame *Ovid* had learn'd from the Prophetic Books (*i*).

Remembring in the Fates a time, when Fire
Should to the Battlements of Heaven aſpire;
And all the blazing Worlds above ſhould burn,
And all th' inferior Globe to Cinders turn.

The firſt Chriſtians produc'd many things out of the *Sibylline Oracles* concerning Chriſt their King, who ſhould give Peace and Salvation to the whole World. *Cicero* alſo ſays, (*k*) that an Interpreter of the *Sibylline Books* complimented *Julius Cæſar* (the real, tho' not nominal King at that time) with this Sentence, *That they muſt have a King, if they would be ſav'd.* By which Prophecy, *Molinæus* (at other times no great favourer of the *Sibylline Oracles*) profeſſes he thought Chriſt and his Kingdom was intended, by which Salvation was procur'd for all who would obey him. *Grotius* (*l*) alſo was of the ſame mind.

7. But thoſe Paſſages are more eſpecially clear, which *Virgil* takes from the *Cumæan* Verſes of the Boy, who was to deſcend from Heaven, to be born of a Virgin, to rule the whole World, to blot out the Sins of Men, to deſtroy the Serpent, and reſtore the Golden Age; all which things, the Poet gathering from Circumſtances that the time by the *Sibyl* intended was come, and not underſtanding the Senſe of them, by baſe Flattery, (or if you pleaſe, poetical Licence) apply'd to *Saloninus* the Son of *Pollio*, juſt

(*h*) Pag. 66. (*i*) Ovid's Metamorphoſis, Lib. 1.
(*k*) Lib. de Divinatione 2. *p.* 273. Ed. Gryph. 1570. *vol.* 2. *Oper. Philoſoph.* (*l*) *Upon* Matthew, *cap.* 2. *ver.* 1.

born.

born. Of these again *Molinæus* professes, that when he has consider'd them very attentively, he has often been amaz'd, how it should happen that those Verses of that fourth Eclogue, taken, as *Virgil* owns, from the *Sibylline Oracles*, should so exactly correspond with the Nativity and Kingdom of Christ. *Molinæus* adds, that the Verses are more considerable, as they were wrote by *Virgil* at *Rome*, (where the *Sibylline Books* were kept in the *Palatine* Library) at that time when Christ was born in *Judea*. But it will be worth our while to transcribe these Verses with *Molinæus*'s Notes upon them. *The Poet then rising above the pitch of an Eclogue, thus begins:*

Sicilian *Muse, begin a loftier Strain!*

Then adds,

The last great Age, foretold by sacred Rhimes,
Renews its finish'd Course; Saturnian *times*
Roll round again; and mighty Years, begun
From their first Orb, in radiant Circles run:
The base degenerate Iron Offspring ends;
A Golden Progeny from Heaven descends;
O chaste Lucina *speed*———

These things are wonderful, the Virgin, the Boy born, sent down from Heaven, the Golden Ages under him, and these things copy'd from the Sibylline Verses, *and that at the time when Christ was born. Then he thus addresses the Boy:*

Thou Child being Consul, Virtue shalt restore,
And Crimes shall threat the guilty World no more.

He foretels that our Sins shall be blotted out by him. O how remote from the common Poetical way! But he promises also the Destruction of the Serpent under his Reign:

The Serpent's Brood shall die; the sacred Ground
Shall Weeds and poisonous Herbs refuse to bear,
Each common Bush shall Syrian *Roses wear.*

And a little after:

The

The jarring Nations he in Peace ſhall bind,
And with paternal Virtues rule Mankind.

By [the deceitful poiſonous Herb] *he underſtands the falſe Doctrines and worſhip of Idols; by the* Aſſyrian Amomus, *which ſhould grow every where, the Doctrine of the Goſpel to be propagated through the World. In the* Sibylline Verſes *it was the* Syrian Amomus, &c. *For* Judea *is in* Syria, *from whence the preaching of the Goſpel firſt came. But* Virgil, *by an eaſy change, put* Aſſyrian *for* Syrian, *for the ſake of his Metre.*

8. You'll ask, whence the Heathens had theſe clear Oracles concerning Chriſt? I ſay from the *Jews*, eſpecially thoſe of the Diſperſion, who upon every opportunity given, and even without it, with great elation, preach'd up the magnificent Things in the Oracles of the Prophets, as pertaining to their King the *Meſſiah*, who was to come. For from the time that the *Jews* were driven into Baniſhment, the Promiſes and Predictions of the Prophets concerning the *Meſſiah* and a future State, were more clearly perceiv'd by all the People of God than ever before; the gracious Providence of God ſo ordering it, that the afflicted People, who groan'd under a foreign Yoke, ſhould be rais'd by the hope of the Promiſes. The Writings of the *Hebrews*, who liv'd between the *Babyloniſh* Captivity, and the coming of the Lord, fully prove this Point. He that doubts whether theſe famous Oracles came into the hands of the Heathen, may do well to conſider that memorable Prophecy related both by *Cornelius Tacitus*, and *Suetonius*, that there was a notion all the World over, that one ſhould ariſe out of *Judea* who ſhould govern the World. *Tacitus* ſays, (*m*) *Many were then perſuaded that it was contain'd in the antient Learning of the Prieſts, that the* Eaſt *ſhould be famous, and the* Jews *ſhould rule the World.* Suetonius (*n*): *There was*

(*m*) Tacit. *Hiſt.* 5 Lib. *p.* 532. Ed. Ryckii.
(*n*) *Pag.* 1099. Baſil 1542.

an

an old uniform Opinion all over the Eaſt, that it was determined that the Jews *ſhould govern the World.*

9. If you ask me another Queſtion, how thoſe *Jewiſh* Oracles crept into the *Sibylline Books* kept in the Capitol, I've an anſwer ready for you. The *Sibylline* Books were of two kinds, ſome bought by *Tarquin*, and preſerved in the Capitol till the days of *Sylla*, when they were burnt together with the Capitol; theſe, (as appears from *Livy*) were dictated by the Devil upon account of the many impious, and idolatrous Superſtitions preſcribed in them. But beſides theſe, there were others fetch'd from *Erythræ*, and alſo laid up in the Capitol at *Rome*, by three Ambaſſadors appointed by the Senate for that purpoſe after the Capitol was rebuilt. Theſe (*o*) *Lactantius* ſays conſiſted of a thouſand Verſes. But *Tacitus* (*p*) tells us, that ſome Perſons were alſo ſent by *Octavius Auguſtus* to collect the other Verſes in ſeveral Parts: *Having collected the* Sibylline *Verſes from* Samos, Ilion, Erythræ, *through* Africa *alſo*, Sicily, *and the* Italian *Colonies, the Prieſts were employ'd, as much as humanly they could, to diſtinguiſh the genuine.* And *Suetonius* (*q*): *Whatſoever Prophetical Books,* Greek *or* Latin, *were ſpread abroad, either Anonymous or under Names Improbable, being in number above* 2000, *he gathered together and burnt*; *he only retained the Books of the* Sibylline, *and of them but a ſelect part, and laid them up in two Golden Caſes under the Baſe of* Apollo Palatinus. Further, *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus* (*r*) writes thus of this Collection: *The* Sibylline *Verſes now extant are what were collected out of many places, ſome from the* Italian *Cities, ſome from* Erythræ *in* Aſia, *and ſome from other Countries*; *yea, ſome were tranſcribed from the Papers of private Men.* Now in this ſearch after the *Sibylline* Oracles, it is plain many other Oracles, and even theſe *Jewiſh*, might be taken for the *Sibylline* (a name given to all fa-

(*o*) Lib. 1. Cap. 6. p. 28. (*p*) P. 162. (*q*) P. 273.
(*r*) Lib. 4.

mous

mous Oracles, ſuch as *Sibylline* properly ſo called were) and be brought to *Rome* among the reſt. For it was utterly impoſſible for the *Roman* Prieſts, in ſuch an abundance of prophetick Books, to diſcern the genuine from the ſpurious. For by what ſure Token could they find out which were truly *Sibylline*, and which only ſo in pretence? Were they ſo well acquainted with the Original, burnt in the Capitol, that upon ſight of a Copy, they could remember the difference? No, no, for beſides that thoſe Prophecies were only ſeldom, and upon extraordinary Caſes conſulted, that Original of the *Sibylline* Verſes was loſt in the Year of the City 671, that is, 81 Years before Chriſt was born. This Review was made at *Rome* in the Year 741, that is 11 Years before the Birth of Chriſt, when *Auguſtus* himſelf was *Pontifex Maximus*. So then there are 70 entire Years between this Review and the Loſs of the Original, when the Capitol was burnt. But were there not other Copies remaining at *Rome*, after the loſs of this Original as *Baronius* ſuppoſes? It is very improbable. For (as *Molinæus* well obſerves) if theſe Verſes had ſurvived the Capitol, the Senate would not have ſent an Embaſſy to repair the Loſs, and collect them through all *Greece*. What Rule had theſe Prieſts, by which they could diſtinguiſh the true Verſes from the falſe? None. *Tacitus* therefore ſpeaks cautiouſly in the aforecited place [*as much as humanly they could.*]

10. The Original then of what are called the *Sibylline* Oracles concerning Chriſt, is to me very clear: They came from the *Jews*. *Gregory Nazianzen* was among the Antients alſo of this opinion (*s*), who in his Poem to *Nemeſius*, ſays, That *Triſmegiſtus* and the *Sibyl* did not foretel what they propheſied of God, by divine Inſpiration, but borrowed them from the ſacred Books of the *Hebrews*. In this alone he

(*s*) In Carmine ad Nemeſium.

was

was mistaken, that he thought those Oracles were compiled by the *Sybyls:* so *Clemens Alex.* (*t*) before him calls the *Sibyl* the *Hebrew* Prophetess. Thus also *Grotius*(*u*); and indeed in these Verses there are many plain Tokens of this Original. Such is that cited by *Lactantius* (*x*) in praise of the *Jewish* Nation: *The Divine Nation of the happy and heaven-born* Jews. And that: *When* Rome *shall unite* Egypt *to her Empire, then the supreme Kingdom of the immortal King shall appear over Men.* Which Words plainly contain an Explication of *Daniel*'s Prophecy concerning the Divine Empire of the Messiah after the Posterity of *Seleucus* and *Lagus* ceas'd to reign. Of the same kind is that concerning the erecting the Holy City *Jerusalem* into the Metropolis of the whole World:

(*y*) *And the City which God hath made, he hath made*
More splendid than the Stars, and Sun, or Moon.

Nay, the Collector of these *Sibylline* Verses almost every where speaks of the Messiah's Kingdom, as the *Jews* do. Thus he writes of the universal Peace, which should happen in his days:

The Wolves pair with the Lambs upon the Mountains,
The Lynx eat Grass with the Kids;
The Bears of a savage Nature shall eat Hay at the Mangers
With the Oxen,
And the Dragons shall lie with the sucking Children
without their Mothers.

Compare (*z*) *Isaiah*'s Description with this. Thus of the Plenty:

Then God shall give great Joy to Men;
For the Earth, the Trees, and numerous Cattle
Shall yield Men their genuine Fruits,
Wine, sweet Honey, and white Milk
And Bread, to Men the best of all things.

(*t*) P. 35. (*u*) Ad Matth. Cap. 2. v. 1. (*x*) Lib. 4. cap. 20. p. 364. (*y*) Lib. 7. Cap. 24. p. 666. (*z*) Ch. 11. v. 6, 7. *and* Ch. 65. 25.

And

And again in the ſame manner:

The ſacred Land of the pious only ſhall yield all theſe things.
To all the Juſt a River of Honey ſhall flow from a Rock,
And Milk from a never-failing Fountain.

Where this is chiefly to be obſerved as a Privilege of the Holy Land of *Judea*. Thus the Prince of Poets deſcribes the Golden Ages of his King, who was about to be born, in almoſt the ſame Words from the *Cumæan* Verſes.

11. Now all theſe things are to be underſtood concerning the *Sibylline* Oracles alledged by *Juſtin*, *Clement*, *Theophilus*, and thoſe antienter Fathers; for I don't deny that the Chriſtians of later days inſerted ſome things into the *Sibylline* Books. Of this kind is the *Acroſtick*, which *Conſtantine*, or, as others will have it, *Euſebius* (*a*), mentioned in his Oration to the Saints; where the firſt Letter of the Verſes make theſe Words in *Greek*, *Jeſus Chriſt*, *the Son of God*, *the Saviour*, *the Croſs*. Of which indeed, neither *Juſtin*, nor *Theophilus*, nor *Clement* of *Alex.* have any where ſaid any thing. *Cicero* (*b*) alſo ſpeaks of an Acroſtick of the *Sibyl*, but no where tells us what was in it. Without doubt alſo thoſe *Sibylline* Oracles are likewiſe ſpurious, in which we have an account of ſome things which Chriſt did, ſo clear and circumſtantial, that you'd rather take it for a Hiſtory than a Prophecy. Such is the miracle of the Loaves from *Lactantius* (*c*):

He ſhall feed five thouſand in the Wilderneſs
With five Loaves, and two Fiſhes;
And gathering what remains, after having broken to all,
Shall fill twelve Baskets, for the ſupport of the Multitude.

Who can think that theſe and other things like them, which we have in *Lactantius*, are not taken from the Hiſtory of the Goſpel? You have not any ſuch

(*a*) P. 488. (*b*) De Divin. p. 271. (*c*) Lib. 4. cap. 15. p. 342.

things

things cited out of the *Sibylline* Verſes by *Juſtin*, *Theophilus*, or *Clement*; but they being very diligent Readers of theſe Oracles, and omitting no Opportunity of beating the Heathen with their own Weapons, would never have paſs'd over in ſilence ſuch flagrant Prophecies of Chriſt, if any ſuch had appeared in their Copies. Now *Lactantius*, who wrote his Books about the beginning of the 4th Century, when *Conſtantine* became Chriſtian, was the firſt who produced thoſe Verſes againſt the Heathens, under the name of *Sibylline*.

12. The whole of the matter is this: (1.) It is certain there were ſome Prophecies among the Heathens, before the Birth of Chriſt, which went under this name, in which was expounded the Worſhip of the one God, and thoſe things which belonged to the future Kingdom of Chriſt, and which *Juſtin* and other Primitive Chriſtians did very properly appeal to, in their Diſputes with the Heathens. (2.) It's very probable, that thoſe Oracles did not come from the *Sibyls*, Heathen Women, as was thought; but from wiſe Men, who flouriſhed among the People of God, the *Jews* after the *Babyloniſh* Captivity. Nor are we to wonder that they have more fully and plainly laid open the obſcure Oracles of the Prophets, if we conſider ſeriouſly the divine Purpoſe, that the nearer the Times of the Goſpel approach'd, the more clear the Promiſes and Predictions of it ſhould ſhine forth, that God intended a brighter Dawn before the riſing of this glorious Sun. Laſtly, it is but too manifeſt, that ſome things were forg'd, made up, and added to theſe Oracles, in the way of clearer Explication of them, by ſome idle, ill-employ'd Profeſſors of Chriſtianity. This the old Serpent ſeems to have effected with this Deſign (as *Molinæus* has well obſerv'd) that there appearing a greater mixture of Falſhood than Truth, he might render the Truth ſuſpected. Thus much by the way concerning the *Sibylline Oracles*, which I hope will not be unacceptable to the Reader. I now return to the *Orphic Verſes* and *Zuicker*. 13.

13. Now I have one Argument to produce, which will put the Matter beyond all Question, that the *Orphic* Verses, cited by *Justin*, let them come from what Quarter they will, can't be the Forgery of any *Simonian*. They contain in them such things concerning God and the Creation of the World, as are widely different from the *Simonian* Heresy. All those, who have had any acquaintance with *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and the other Fathers, that have wrote concerning the *Simonians*, know, that those Hereticks taught the visible World was made, not by God himself, nor by his Word, but by inferior Powers. On the other hand, the Author of the *Orphic* Verses every where affirms, That this visible World was the work of the supreme God, and created by his Word, as you may see in that long Citation of them in (*d*) *Justin*'s Exhortation to the Heathen. Nay, the very Verses which *Zuicker* cites in part, and which immediately follow those in *Justin*, contain the same Doctrine. Thus they run:

I adjure thee by the Heaven, the work of the great and wise God,
By the Voice of the Father, which he spake in the beginning,
When he made the Universe by his own Counsel.

So that I am of opinion the Verses may rather be any Person's than a *Simonian*'s. Thus I have said enough, and too much concerning *Zuicker*'s Conjecture (or rather Delirium) that the *Orphic* Verses were forg'd by the *Simonians*.

14. He has advanc'd another no less, nay much more absurd Guess, one that has not any appearance of Truth, namely, That *Justin* depending upon these Verses, propos'd his Opinion of the Son's Generation before the World was made. For who in his right Senses could suspect, that a Holy and a Prudent Man had built his Faith and Opinion concerning a

(*d*) Pag. 15, & 16.

primary Article of Chriſtianity upon the Verſes of a Heathen, and even (as *Zuicker* obſerves) a Magician; or that an Argument of ſo little weight, indeed of none at all, ſhould move him to depart from the Rule of the Apoſtolical Doctrine, which obtain'd every where in the Churches before his time? It is further very obſervable, that *Juſtin* never profeſſedly cites the *Orphic* Verſes, to eſtabliſh his Opinion concerning the Son's Generation. If I remember right, he only cites them twice, and in both the Places only makes uſe of them to defend the One God againſt the Heathen Polytheiſm. In the former Place, he illuſtrates thoſe Verſes concerning the Word and Voice of the Father, by his own Notes, not giving the leaſt intimation that *Orpheus* had taught him the Doctrine of the Son's Generation; but on the other hand expreſly affirming, that that Author had been oblig'd to the ſacred Oracles of the *Old Teſtament* for his Notions of the Word. Thus he writes: *Here he calls the Word of God* [the Voice] *that Word, by which the Heaven, the Earth, and every Creature was made, as the divine Prophecies of the Holy Men teach us, by conſulting ſome part of which, in* Ægypt, *this* [Orpheus] *found that all things were made by the Word of God.* He who reads theſe Words of *Juſtin*, muſt wonder, no doubt, how *Zuicker* could for ſhame ſay, *That* Juſtin, *and almoſt all his Succeſſors, conform'd and accommodated their Opinion of Chriſt to the* Orphic *Verſes, as to a certain divine Foundation.* But why do I dwell upon ſuch manifeſt Trifles and Impertinences? To repeat this Conjecture, to ſober Minds, is a ſufficient Confutation of it.

CHAP. V.

That Justin *did not learn from the* Platonics, *the Notions he has given us of the Word.*

HAVING consider'd, and very justly rejected the primary Causes, which, according to *Zuicker*'s Conjectures, mov'd *Justin* to ascribe a divine Nature to *Jesus Christ*; I come now to examine the secondary Causes which, *Zuicker* pretends, induced him to continue in this Error. Nor do I doubt, but that, after having defeated the main Body, which the Heretick led up against the divine Truth, I shall gain a cheap Victory over his Forces in reserve. These Causes are four: (1.) *The Love of the* Platonic *Philosophy.* (2.) *The Memory of Gentilism not yet obliterated.* (3.) *The custom of Deifying excellent Men.* (4.) *And the superstitious Dread of worshipping him who is only Man.*

2. Before we examine these unhappily invented Causes particularly, and every one in its own Order, we can't but in general observe, that *Zuicker* (for all his Boasts that he has done the Business, and actually discover'd the Original of making this new Christ) is doubtful, and altogether uncertain which way, except from the Scripture, and the preaching of the Apostles, the Doctrine of the Son's Divinity could be introduc'd into the Christian Church; for if he could have been sure of any one Cause, to which he might have ascrib'd the Original of it, why should he have troubled us with so many, and those (as we shall shew by and by) contradictory to one another? For first he attempts to shew, that the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, concerning our Lord's Divinity, sprung from the *Simonian* Heresy. In this Strong-hold (a Castle in the Air, and, as we have seen, easily demolish'd) he places the greatest hopes of his Heresy. But nevertheless, not thinking himself secure in it, he has sought another Refuge; pretending, that there were

certain Verſes forg'd by the *Simonians* under the Name of *Orpheus*, which alas! ſeduc'd *Juſtin* into this Error, and after him, the whole Catholick Church. What can be more ſilly than this Fancy? Diſtruſting it therefore, as he well might, he liſts a Quaternion of ſtout Reaſons into the ſervice of his deſperate Cauſe, boaſts that he has done the Buſineſs, diſcover'd the Original of the Cheat, and ſeems to triumph over the defeated Truth. But ſtill he is not ſo ſafe as he would ſeem to be; after he has muſter'd all his Forces, he has a Reſerve for himſelf, either to raiſe more as he pleaſes, or to ſet his Reader's Wit to work. The Caſe is this: *Zuicker* was reſolv'd to reject the Doctrine of the Son's divine Nature, as abſurd, and contrary to ſound Reaſon, (a thing he often boaſts, but never ſhews) therefore to ſerve this Cauſe, he would rather aſcribe the Original of it to any thing, than that (which evidently appears from the thing itſelf to have been the true Cauſe) namely, that it was part of the Apoſtolical Doctrine, deliver'd and promulg'd every where in the Primitive Churches, together with the Goſpel itſelf. But we will now attack this reſerv'd Body.

3. The Knowledge and Love of the *Platonic* Philoſophy is (according to *Zuicker*) the firſt of thoſe Cauſes, which engag'd *Juſtin* and his Followers to receive the Son's Divinity. The Heretick would inſinuate forſooth, that *Juſtin*, formerly an Admirer of this Philoſophy, and too much delighted with the Tenets of his old Maſter, which he had read concerning the Word, after he became a Chriſtian, tranſlated them into the Chriſtian Faith, and adulterated the Purity and Simplicity of the Goſpel, with a mixture of Heathen Philoſophy. In this Cry the Unitarians all run, this is the burden of their Song, *Platoniſm, Platoniſm! the Bane of the ſincere Apoſtolical Religion!* Now I'm ſure that *Zuicker* and others, who have ſo hard an Opinion of that excellent and incomparable Man (whom *Photius* juſtly praiſes in *theſe words* (*e*):

(*e*) Cod. 234. *p.* 922.

A

A Man neither in Time, nor Virtue, far short of the Apostles) are either perfect Strangers in his Works, or are resolv'd to deal with the venerable Father, without any regard to Charity or Justice. For how often, and how plainly, with what a warm Zeal and Affection does *Justin* himself (the Person unworthily calumniated by this Heretick) profess, that after he knew Christ, he renounc'd, not only the Philosophy of *Plato*, but also that of every other Sect, and only admired the most Holy Scriptures. Read his incomparable Dialogue with *Trypho* the *Jew*. There indeed (not far from the beginning) he confesses that he was a very great Admirer of *Plato* before he knew *Christ*; but there also, he censures his former Folly. These are his Words (*f*): *Not knowing which way to turn, I thought fit to acquaint myself with the* Platonists, *for they were in great Fame; I therefore convers'd very much with an understanding Man, who but lately came to our City, a Master in Platonism, I made a Proficiency and very great Improvements daily. I was greatly taken with the Notion of Incorporeals, and the Theory of Ideas rais'd my Mind; I thought myself wise in a little time, and vainly dreamt of seeing God shortly.* A little after in the same Dialogue, he gives the Reasons which drew him off from Platonism to Christianity, in a feign'd Conference (if I mistake not) between a certain venerable old Man and Himself, while he liv'd in retirement. Among other things, the old Man, when he propos'd to him *Plato*, *Pythagoras*, and other wise Men, contrary to the Truth, says (*g*), *I care not for your* Plato, *or* Pythagoras, *or indeed for any of your wise Thinkers in that way, for this is the Truth.* Then when *Justin* asks him (*h*), *Who then must a Man take for his Master; or from whom may he improve, if these Persons have not the Truth?* The old Man answers, *There was a sort of Men a long time ago more antient than all the reputed Philosophers, happy, just, pious Men, who spake by the Spirit of God, and*

(*f*) P. 219. (*g*) P. 224. (*h*) Ibidem.

foretold things future which are now come to pass, (they call them Prophets) these only saw and reveal'd the Truth to Men. The venerable old Man adds, in the same Place, many more things worth reading. But *Justin* himself in the close, shews us how he was affected by the Conference (*i*). *My Soul was inflam'd immediately, and I was all in love with the Prophets and the Friends of Christ. After I had discuss'd his Words in myself, I found this to be the only sound and useful Philosophy. After this Manner, and by these Steps, I became a Philosopher.* Therefore the Love of Platonism, which burnt in *Justin's* Breast before, was extinguish'd by the Knowledge of the heavenly Doctrine. The new heat of the Sacred Writings came into the place of it, and penetrated the most intimate Recesses of the holy Man.

4. With what Care he afterwards fed this heavenly Flame, is also very clear from his Writings, in which he every were wonderfully extols the Holy Scripture, (despising the best Philosophy in comparison of them) appeals to them, and strenuously affirms, that they are the only Fountains of divine Truth. His Words in the beginning of his Exhortation to the *Greeks*, are very observable (*k*): there, after he had largely shewn that there is no certainty about divine Matters to be found in the Writings of the Philosophers, of what Sect soever, at length he concludes; *Since then it is not possible to learn the Truths of Religion of your Masters, who have given you sufficient demonstration of their Ignorance by their Division among themselves; it is rational to pass over to our Ancestors, Men much more antient than your Doctors, Men who don't teach us from their own Fancy, that don't differ among themselves, or attempt to overturn each other's Schemes; but without Contention and Division, having receiv'd Knowledge from God, teach us the same.* For it was not possible by Nature and human Thought to know the sublime things of God; but by the Gift of God, which then descended from above upon those

(*i*) P. 225. (*k*) P. 8, & 9.

Holy

Holy Men. What can be more clear or direct to our purpose? *Justin* thought that we cou'd not come at the certain Knowledge of any thing Divine from the Heathen Philosophers, and therefore in such Disquisitions, we must have recourse to inspired Men. Is it probable then that he wou'd borrow that Notion of his concerning God, and the divine Persons, (the most sublime of all Divine things) from the Writings of *Plato*, or the Philosophers of any other Sect? But he expresly teaches in another place, that the Scriptures alone are to be heard in all Questions of Religion, that our Proofs are to be fetch'd from them, that the Words of Scripture are often and often to be inculcated, and no Man can find any thing better than what is taught in the same Scriptures. These are the Words in the Dialogue with *Trypho* (*l*): *It is a ridiculous thing to see the Sun, the Moon, and Stars always take the same Course, and make the same conversions of Seasons; or to see an Arithmetician not scruple to answer that two and two are four, when he is ask'd, tho' he has often said so before; and likewise to have other things, well establish'd already, again asserted and confess'd: but that a Person should cease to discourse from the Prophetick Writings, should be weary of always repeating the same Scriptures, and suppose he can say something better than they.* In these Words he very elegantly describes that great Confidence, with which a Christian firmly adheres to the Holy Scriptures. You may sooner turn the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, out of their usual Course; or persuade a Mathematician to forsake his well-known Principles, than move a true Christian from that sacred and certain Rule of his, the Scriptures. Who now can suspect that *Justin*, in the fundamental Doctrine of Christianity, turn'd aside from the old Path to strange Tenets, and would introduce into the Christian Churches a new Doctrine concerning Christ, and (to speak in *Zuicker*'s Language) a *new Christ*, contrary to

(*l*) P. 311, & 312.

the Truth of Scripture itself, and the universal Apostolical Tradition before his Days.

5. Moreover, the excellent Father (as tho' he had been a Prophet, and foreseen Futurity) has, as it were, professedly prevented this Calumny of *Zuicker's* in his own Words, for he expresly says in several Places, That the Doctrine of Christians, concerning the Word, tho' like *Plato's*, is not deriv'd from the *Platonics*; but rather *Plato* had borrow'd all his right Notions concerning the Word of God from the Church, (to which the Doctrine was formerly known in part). Thus, after he hath confess'd that the Doctrines of *Plato* are not unlike those of Christ, he quickly subjoins (*m*): *Whatsoever things are said well by all Writers, are ours, who are Christians. For we after God* [the Father] *worship the Word of the unbegotten ineffable God, and love him; for as much as he was made Man for us, that so being partaker of our Sufferings, he might cure us. For all Writers, by the Seed of the natural Word which is in them, are able, in a faint way, to discern the things that are. For the Seed of any thing, or the Imitation of it, which is given us according to our Capacity, is one thing, and that thing it self, by whose Grace a Communication from him, and an Imitation is granted, is another thing.* Here you'll observe by the bye, that *Justin* does not defend what he had discours'd concerning the Word, as his own Sentiment, but as the common Doctrine and Faith of all Christians. He speaks still more plainly of this Matter in his second Apology to *Antoninus*, near the end (*n*); where, after having said that *Plato* had learn'd, that the Universe was made by the Word of God, yea, that the third Person of the Trinity, namely, the Holy Spirit, was not altogether unknown to *Plato*, he adds: *We then don't think the same as others, but all Men imitate us, and say as we say. With us you may hear and learn the same things from those, who know not their Letters, who are Idiots and Barbarians in Speech, but*

(*m*) P. 51. (*n*) P. 93.

faith-

faithful and wise in Mind, from Men that are maim'd and blind; from whence it is plain, these things are not brought about by Man's Wisdom, but dictated by the Power of God. This Place alone would be sufficient, utterly to demolish all the Pile of Conjectures (as great as it is) which *Zuicker* has erected against the Truth. For, (1.) In this Place *Justin* plainly teaches, That the Doctrine of the Creation by the Word, was neither taken by him, or any other Christian from the Works of *Plato*, but rather, that *Plato* borrow'd his Notions of the Word from the Holy Books of the Christians (namely, from the *Old Testament*, as he afterwards explains himself.) (2.) He asserts and defends this Doctrine, not as his own singular Opinion, but as the Faith and Doctrine of the Catholick Church, *i. e.* of all Christians, before the Emperor and the Heathens. (3.) From these things he very justly concludes, that the Christians were not taught that Doctrine by Man's Wisdom, (from the Writings of *Plato*, much less from the filthy Dreams of the worst Hereticks) but utter'd it by the Power of God, from Writings divinely inspired, and the Apostolical Doctrine every where propagated. Surely then, from this Evidence, it is plain that *Justin* had the same Opinion of the Heathen Philosophy, as *Tertullian*; and, according to him, all the old Catholick Christians had. His Words are admirable (*o*): *St.* Paul *testifies that we must take care of Philosophy, in his Epistle to the* Colossians: See that no man deceive you by vain philosophy and seduction, according to the tradition of men. *He had been at* Athens, *and knew that human Wisdom familiarly, which affects the Name of Truth, and adulterates it, which is split into a multitude of Sects mutually opposing one another. What has* Jerusalem *to do with* Athens? *the Academy with the Church? and Christians with Hereticks? Our Institution is to be learnt from* Solomon's *Porch, who himself taught, that we must seek the Lord in simplicity of Heart. Let*

(*o*) P. 204, and 205.

them

them look to it, who have coin'd us a Stoical, a Platonical, and a Logical Christianity. We have no need of curiosity after Christ Jesus, or an inquisition after the Gospel. When we believe, we have no occasion for believing further; for the first thing we believe, is, that we ought to believe no more.

6. It is now scarce necessary to revive, or continue the Controversy among the Learned, whether *Plato*'s Opinion concerning the Word be like *Justin*'s, and others of the same Mind. He, who has an Inclination may consult (*p*) *Casaubon* and *Lanselius*. This is certain, that there is so great a Difference between the Opinions of *Plato* and *Justin*, that it is clear enough from thence, that *Justin* did not borrow his Notions from *Plato*. Hence also, *Justin* himself tells us (*q*) expressly, that *Plato* had but a *slender* and obscure view of that Mystery.

7. Therefore, to conclude this Chapter, *Zuicker* judg'd that *Justin* had taken his Doctrine concerning the Word, from the School of *Plato*, with the same probability, as formerly *Amelius* the *Platonic* Philosopher, upon reading the first Verses of St. *John*'s Gospel, complain'd that the Evangelist had transcrib'd the Mysteries of his Master into his Book, and made *Plato*'s Secrets his own. *By Jove*, says he, *the Barbarian is of our* Plato*'s mind, That the Word of God is constituted in the order of a Principle.* And we have an Unitarian of our own, who has presumed in plain Terms to teach, that the Doctrine of the Apostle St. *John* in the beginning of his Gospel, is borrow'd from the *Platonic* Philosophers. It is the Author of a Book intitled, *The Historical Vindication of a Book call'd the* Naked Gospel, *presented to the University of* Oxford. In the Preface to the Reader, he bitterly inveighs against those *who have adulterated the plain and primitive Purity of the Gospel, with the Ceremonies and vain Philo-*

(*p*) Exercitationes ad Apparatum Baronianum, *p.* 5. & Petrus Lanselius ad calcem operum Justini Martyris, *c.* 1.

(*q*) *In the place before cited.*

sophy

phy of the Pagans, and obtruded the Enthuſiaſm of Plato *upon the World, for Faith, Myſtery, and Revelation,* &c. No Man is ſo dull as not to perceive, that the Sacred Doctrine of the moſt Holy Trinity, acknowledg'd and receiv'd by the Catholick Church, is here ſtruck at. But in the Work it ſelf, he attempts to ſhew, how that vain Philoſophy, the *Platonic* Enthuſiaſm, firſt made its way into the Jewiſh, and then into the Chriſtian Church. He ſays (*r*), that the *Jews* diſpers'd in *Ægypt* and *Syria*, firſt learn'd the Philoſophy of *Plato* brought out of *Greece* into thoſe Countries; that there were two principal Doctrines of the *Platonic* Philoſophy, one concerning the Pre-exiſtence of Souls, and the other of the Divine Trinity; and that therefore theſe two Doctrines did afterwards obtain in the Jewiſh Church. After this, in the next Page (*s*), you have his expreſs Words: *Theſe were the Opinions of the* Jews *in the Days of our Saviour and his Apoſtles; and hence, perhaps, it came to paſs, that ſome of the Phraſes and Manners of Speech uſed by the* Platoniſts, *as the Learned have obſerv'd, are found in the* New Teſtament, *eſpecially in the Goſpel of St.* John. *The Obſervation of* Amelius *the* Platonic *Philoſopher, upon reading the beginning of St.* John's *Goſpel, is well known, namely, that the Apoſtle ſpoke like* Plato. *Indeed that Philoſopher might ſay, conſiſtent with his Principles, the Reaſon was in the beginning with God, and was God. It is he who made all things, and is the Life and Light of Men.* From the collation of theſe two Places, it is very evident, that this Author thought the Doctrine deliver'd by St. *John*, in the beginning of his Goſpel, was not divinely inſpir'd, but taken from the vain Philoſophy of the Pagans, and very ſtrong of the *Platonic* Enthuſiaſm. We may juſtly cry out again in the Words of Holy *Polycarp*, *Good God, for what times haſt thou reſerv'd us, that we ſhould bear theſe things!* But this Author equally betrays his Ignorance and his Impiety, in ſaying, that the antient

(*r*) Pag. 12, 13. (*s*) Pag. 14.

Jews

Jews in the Diſperſion were inſtructed by the *Platoniſts* in the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity: For on the contrary it is plain, he learn'd all he wrote of this Matter from the more antient Philoſophy of the *Jews*. It is certain alſo, that we may ſee in the Scriptures of the *Old Teſtament*, much older than *Plato*, many Footſteps of this Myſtery, as *Juſtin* has obſerv'd. But if any of our own Countrymen deſire further Satisfaction in this Point, let him go to that clear Treatiſe of our learned *Allix*, wrote in *Engliſh*, and intitled, *The Judgment of the Antient* Jewiſh *Church againſt the* Unitarians.

CHAP. VI.

That Juſtin *entirely abhorr'd* Paganiſm, *and the Worſhip of more Gods. That the Argument uſed by* Juſtin *and other Antients in ſupport of Chriſt's Divinity, from the divine Worſhip given to him in Holy Scriptures, is invincible.*

1. THE other three Cauſes *Zuicker* has invented, may be reduc'd to two: The Memory of Gentiliſm or more Gods not quite obliterated, and the Cuſtom of Deifying excellent Men, may make one; (for no doubt the latter is a piece of Gentiliſm not obliterated:) and the ſuperſtitious Dread of worſhipping him who is only Man, another. As for the former, I can't but admire *Zuicker's*, the Inventor's extreme Impudence, or groſs Ignorance in the Writings of *Juſtin*. Read, I beſeech you, his Exhortation to the *Greeks*, both his Apologies, and his Piece concerning the Monarchy of God. How many good Arguments does he there bring againſt the Polytheiſm of the Heathens? Beſides, who can believe that an excellent Doctor of the Chriſtian Faith, was not fully in-

inſtructed in the prime Doctrine of the Goſpel concerning one God? Or, that the ſtouteſt Champion of Chriſt againſt the Pagan Superſtitions and Impieties, yea, a Martyr alſo, was yet ſo deep in the foulest Error of Paganiſm?

2. As for that other Cauſe (the laſt which the Heretick's little Head cou'd run to) it is to be obſerv'd, that it is diametrically oppoſite to the former. For doubtleſs, that any one ſhould be well-affected to the Cuſtom of Deifying Men, and yet ſhould dread the worſhipping him who was Man only, is impoſſible, thoſe two things being inconſiſtent. Having juſt hinted this, we will conſider that Cauſe by it ſelf. Now here we will grant it to *Zuicker*, that *Juſtin*, and other Fathers, were perſuaded by this Argument among others, to aſcribe a Divine Nature to Chriſt, namely, that in the Holy Scriptures Worſhip and divine Adoration are often and expreſly preſcribed to be given to him; but what will the Heretick gain by this Conceſſion? Nothing at all: for certainly that Reaſon is a Foundation ſufficient to ſupport the Opinion. That the Worſhip and Adoration which is truly Divine, ought not to be paid to any Creature, in himſelf tho' never ſo excellent, but to him only who is truly God, Reaſon dictates, and many expreſs Teſtimonies of Holy Scripture prove. I here ask your pardon, Chriſtian Reader, if I am ſomething long in making good this Point, not only upon account of my Promiſe in the beginning of this Piece, but becauſe this Reaſon, rightly weigh'd, ſtrikes at the very Heart of Socinianiſm.

3. (1.) We have the expreſs (*t*) *Command* of God repeated by our Saviour, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* Where the excluſive Particle *only* appropriates divine Worſhip to our Lord and God, and ſuffers not any Creature at all to

(*t*) Deut. 6. 13, 10, 20. *repeated by our Lord in St.* Matth. 4. 10.

par-

partake of it. The *Socinians* except thus (*u*), *That by these exclusive Particles, such as* only, &c. *used of God, those are never simply excluded, who are dependent upon God in the Matter treated on. Thus God is said to be only Wise, Powerful and Immortal; but yet others, who are made partakers of these things, are not to be simply excluded from Wisdom, Power and Immortality. Wherefore when it is said that God only is to be worshipped, he is not to be simply excluded, who in this particular depends upon God; but rather is to be tacitly included upon account of the divine Government he has receiv'd over all things.* But, (1.) who gave these bold Men a Power of excepting where the Law does not except? The Law simply commands that divine Adoration be given to God only. For what they pretend, that it is said in Scriptures God is only wise, *&c.* but yet that others who are made partakers of these things, are not to be simply excluded from Wisdom, *&c.* is a mere Sophism. For tho', when it is said in Scripture that God only is wise, others are not excluded thereby from such a Degree of Wisdom, as comes to their share; yet this is certain, that by the exclusive Particle *only* in those Places, every Creature is excluded from the divine Wisdom, which belongs to God only. In like manner, when it is said in Scripture, that God only is to be worship'd, by that, others are not excluded from such Respect and Honour as belongs to them, yet all others are simply and absolutely excluded from that Worship which only belongs to God. (2.) This Answer supposes, that the divine Government over all things may be communicated to a mere Creature, which is by no means true. For all sober Men, by the divine Government over all things, understand both that Almighty Power by which God preserves, rules, and governs all those Creatures he hath made; and also that Right and Dominion of God which follows from thence, by which every Creature is subject to him, and every rational

(*u*) Schlictingius ad Meisneri articulum de Deo, *p.* 206, & 207.

Crea-

Creature oblig'd to submit himself, and all he has, to God, for the Advancement of his Glory, and his own Benefit. This Divine Government, at least, is the only adequate Foundation of Divine Worship. Now that such a Divine Government over all Things, is not compatible with any Creature, is evident. If therefore Divine Worship is to be given to no one, but to him, to whom the Divine Government over all things is given, (which is certainly true) it will necessarily follow, that Divine Worship is to be given to God only, as is provided by that expres Law we have alledg'd.

4. (2.) St. *Paul* objects this as a Crime to the *Galatians*, that for the time they knew not God, *they served those who were not Gods by Nature* (*x*). From this Place it is plain, that Divine Worship was to be given to no one, who had not the Divine Nature. For it is impossible, that what was the greatest Crime in the *Galatians*, whilst yet *Pagans*, should be lawful for us, bless'd with the Light of the Gospel, much less that it should be the chief Duty of a Christian. *Crellius*'s Answer (*y*) upon this Place is very ridiculous. For he writes thus: *Hence also it appears why St.* Paul *objects this as a Crime to the* Galatians, *altho now past and over, that when they knew not God, they serv'd those, who by Nature were not Gods; namely, because, before there was no true God, those* Galatians *knew of none, as long as they did not know the true God, who was not also God by Nature; and therefore whosoever then worship'd him immediately and always, who was not God by Nature, worship'd a false God.* Who can believe St. *Paul* thought of

(*x*) Gal. 4. 8. *Dr.* Clarke *reads*, To Gods, which have no Being in Nature. *Where is the Difference? Must the Words necessarily be render'd, as he would have them, because they lie in such an Order in the* Alex. MS? *And when they are so render'd, what do they amount to more? See the* Syriac, *a Version well known by the Learned to be of great Authority. That reads*, Which are not in their own nature Gods.

(*y*) Ed. Selenoburgi, p. 229, & 230.

this,

this, when he wrote these Words? Besides, that there should be a true God, who is not God by Nature, seems incomprehensible to every sober Mind, (whatever the *Socinians* may brangle to the contrary.)

5. But the most remarkable Place is in the *Apocalypse* (z), where the Angel thus speaks to *John*, who was prostrate at his feet in order to adore him: *See thou do it not, I am thy Fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren, who have the Testimony of Jesus; worship God.* The Angel refuses St. *John's* Worship upon two accounts: (1.) Because he was his Fellow-Servant; as tho he should say, Whosoever is a Servant of God, is not to be honour'd with Divine Worship; but I am a Servant of God as well as you, tho in a higher Station: therefore you are not by any means to worship me. Surely this Reason equally extends itself to every Creature, since there is no Creature, in what eminent Station soever, who is not a Servant of God, as well as other Creatures. If therefore Christ be a mere Creature, it is unlawful to give him Divine Adoration. I know (a) *Grotius* thought the Worship, which the Angel refus'd from St. *John*, was only Civil Worship, such as we read has been given sometime to the Prophets without Sin; and therefore that the Angel forbad it not, as in itself unlawful, but as too much Respect from one in the Apostolical Office. For so that very learned Person writes in his Explication of the Decalogue: *He that forbids Gifts and Libations, does not forbid Tokens of Reverence, &c. For that the Angel in the* Apocalypse *refuses that Honour, was not, that there was any thing unlawful in it, but that the Angel sets the Apostle upon a level with himself, as being both the Servants of Christ, who is now the Head of the Angels; and that the Office of an Apostle, adapted to the Salvation of Men, is in no respect inferior to the Office of an Angel.*

(z) Ch. 19. ver. 10.
(a) In Explicatione Decalogi, Præcept. 2.

Now

Now Collegues in Office don't use to give one another such Tokens of Submission. But the great Man is mistaken in both Parts of his Opinion. For that it was not Civil Worship, or Respect only, which the Angel rejected, is very plain both from the Words of the Angel, *Worship God*, and also from those other Words, *See thou do it not*; a way of speaking which forbids something, not as indecent only, but unlawful, and absolutely to be avoided. Now the Great Man seems to have erred in this, that he hath not accurately distinguish'd between the Prostration of St. *John*, and the Worship he was about to give when prostrate. The Words are clear, *I fell down at his Feet to worship.* Here it is evident, the Design of what St. *John* did, is chiefly censur'd, and that the Fact was culpable upon that account. For to fall upon the Ground at the Feet of an Angel, is not evil in itself; because it is certain such Respect has formerly been given to Men, to Kings and Prophets, and that often by Holy Men. But the Apostle is blamed for prostrating himself at the Feet of the Angel, in order to worship him, to pay him Divine Worship, (perhaps the Sacrifice of Praise, for his joyful Tidings of the Marriage of the Lamb.) Therefore the Angel did not so much blame what he had done, as forbid what he was about to do: *See thou do it not.* Nor is there any more Truth in it, that the Angel forbad the Worship, for that it was too much for one, who was then honour'd with the Apostolical Office, because it is clear from a *parallel* (*b*) *Place*, that this Prohibition of the Angel was to be extended to all Christians. For there he speaks thus: *See thou do it not, I am thy Fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren the Prophets, and of those who observe the Word of this Book: Worship God.* Here not only the Prophets are mention'd, but also all pious Persons, all Christians, who are described in these Words [*And of those who observe the Words of this Book.*] This De-

(*b*) Apoc. 22. 9.

ſcription is large, and more general than the word [*Prophets*] and therefore is ſet after it, as ſomething more common. So *Crellius* (*c*) himſelf explains the Place. But *Grotius* (*d*), contrary to the Faith of the *Greek* Copies, and plain Reaſon alſo, has omitted the Particle [*and*;] for what end, I know not, except to ſerve his own Purpoſe. Thus much for the former Reaſon: The other we have in theſe Words, *Worſhip God*, which ſeem to be taken from the Divine Command cited by *our Lord*. Now 'tis plain the Words are to be taken excluſively, as tho the Angel had ſaid, That Worſhip, which you was about to give, is only proper to God; ſee therefore that you don't give it me. Otherwiſe there is no force in the Angel's Reaſoning. Theſe Places then (to which I could add many more) invincibly prove (what *Zuicker* ſays *Juſtin* laid as the Foundation of his Opinion concerning the Divine Nature of Chriſt) that Divine Worſhip is not to be given to any one except God.

6. The Arguments brought againſt theſe by the *Socinians*, are of no weight. (1.) They object that Holy Men, under the Old Teſtament, paid Divine Honours, and that without Sin, to Angels, who tranſacted with them in the Name of God. Now in our *Defence of the* Nicene *Creed* (*e*), we have fully prov'd, that as often as any Angel is in Holy Scripture call'd *Jehovah*, and has Divine Honours, the Fathers thought him to be, not a mere Angel, but an Angel join'd to the Word; and that this their Opinion is ſo far from contradicting any part of Scripture, that it is confirm'd by the expreſs Teſtimony of St. *Paul*. I add, that this Opinion is not a little ſtrengthen'd by the Places treated of before, in which Divine Worſhip is appropriated to the true God. But it is moſt eſpecially confirm'd by this, That we don't find in any Age, or Place, under the Goſpel, any one, who was ſaid to be an Angel, and yet thought worthy of ſuch

(*c*) P. 288. (*d*) In locum. (*e*) Sect. 1. Cap. 1.

Ho-

Honour, unless by St. *John*, in the hurry of Affection; by St. *John*, who stands condemn'd by the Angel, for his Intention to pay him such a Worship as was above the Dignity of Angels, and only due to God.

7. Some Learned Divines enquire into the Cause of this; and amongst the rest, *Ribera* (*f*) writes thus: *How is it*, says he, *that Angels are adored before the Coming of our Saviour, and say nothing against it; but afterwards refuse it? It is because they behold him clothed in our Nature, which before they despised, and therefore are afraid to see it prostrate before them. They dare not now contemn, as below them, what they revere, as above them, in the Kingdom of Heaven. Crellius* (*g*) also is fond of this Reason. But indeed I think it rather subtile, than solid; and I am therefore of that Opinion, because in the Place *Ribera* explains, there is no shadow or appearance of it. On the other hand, the Angel refuses the Worship which St. *John* intended him, upon Grounds of perpetual Force and Truth, which equally belong to the Times of the Old and New Testament. (1.) The Angel urges, that he is a Fellow-Servant of the Faithful: Might the same be said of the Angels under the Old Testament? To be sure: For *David* then speaks of the Angels thus: (*h*) *Who made his Angels Spirit, and his Ministers a flaming Fire.* The Angels then under the Old Testament were no less Ministers of God, than Men, tho in that higher Station, in which they remain since the Coming of Christ. This might be proved from many Places of the New Testament, which plainly shew that more eminent Honour and Reverence is due to them, than to any *Mortals* (*i*). (2.) The other Reason of the Angel's, in these words [*Worship God*] has also an evident Relation to the Old Testament. Nay, it seems, as I said before, to be taken from the Words of *Moses*. In

(*f*) In Commentariis in Apocalypsin ad locum, Cap. 19.
(*g*) P. 277.
(*h*) Psal. 104. 5. *Compare with it* Heb. 1. 7. *and last.*
(*i*) 1 Cor. 11. 10. 1 Tim. 5. 21.

ſhort, when we ſpeak about the Worſhip of Angels, we either underſtand Civil Worſhip only, or that which is Divine and Religious. The former is due to them even under the Goſpel, for their great Excellency above Men, and the Eminence of their Power: but under the Law itſelf, it is forbidden to pay them the latter, becauſe of their infinite Diſtance from the Almighty God. Hence we read in the (*k*) Old Teſtament, that the Angel, who appear'd to *Manoah* with the greateſt Caution, prevented the Divine Worſhip, the Sacrifice, intended for him. For when *Manoah* would have detain'd him, that he might make ready for him a ſucking Kid, he anſwers, *If you detain me, I will not eat of the Meat; but if thou wouldſt make ready a Sacrifice, thou ſhalt offer it to the Lord.* As if he ſhould have ſaid, There are two Ends of providing Meat, either that it ſhould be eaten after the manner of Men, or burnt in Sacrifice to God; there is no occaſion for the former, and the latter is unlawful: for know, that *Sacrifice* is only to be offer'd to God.

8. You'll ask then, how ſhall we ſolve the propos'd Difficulty? There is little in it indeed, if you'll ſtand by the Judgment of the Fathers. For they ſay, that the Word and Son of God under the Old Teſtament, the Angel of the Covenant, very often convers'd with Men by Angels, or Angelical Appearances, that is, ſuch as the Angels commonly uſed; and therefore was with very good reaſon worſhipped by Holy Men, to whom he appear'd. Now theſe Appearances, being certain Earneſts, Shadows and Figures of the future Incarnation of the Son of God, did with juſt ground ceaſe after his coming in human Fleſh: when the Truth appear'd, what occaſion for the Shadows of it? Now this Reaſon given by the Fathers, ſeems to me much preferable to all the Conjectures of the Moderns.

(*k*) Judges 13. 16.

9. But

9. But to wave all Conjectures, this is certain, and confessed by the Adversaries themselves, that the truly Divine Worship, such as is in Scripture commanded to be given to Jesus Christ, never ought to be given to Angels, nor ever was given to them by Holy Men under the Old Testament. Therefore the Hereticks freely confess that the Adoration formerly given to Angels (granting that they were Angels) was by them given after a very different manner from that which in the Scripture of the New Testament is given to Jesus Christ. They acknowledge this threefold Difference. 1. The Patriarchs adored the Angel as present and in their sight, by prostrating themselves before him; but we are commanded to pay this Respect to Christ, tho not seen, and (as to his human Nature) far distant from us, even in the Heavens, which chiefly, tho not only, distinguishes Human Worship from Divine. These are almost the very Words of *Crellius* (*l*). 2. He that formerly worship'd an Angel representing God, truly worship'd God himself immediately, the Angel only by accident; nor then was the Angel indeed worship'd as such, but as *representing* God (*m*). Nay, the Person of the Angel was no more worship'd than the Ark of the Covenant, when pious Men worship'd God himself towards it, as a Token of the Divine Presence. On the other hand, our Lord Jesus is in Scripture propos'd to be worship'd immediately. This is so true, that *Socinus* himself grants that Christ is worthy of Divine Honour, and is not commanded to be worship'd in Holy Scripture without the most weighty Reasons, as the Scriptures themselves *teach us* (*n*). 3. Such an Angel was only worshipped for that time, that he appear'd upon Earth in the Name of God, and represented him, after which Divine Worship was no more esteem'd due to him. But our Saviour is perpetually to be worship'd by us. *Crellius* (*o*) restrains this Perpetuity to the Duration of

(*l*) P. 289. (*m*) P. 277. (*n*) Apocal. 5. ver. 12.
(*o*) P. 275.

the World. For he writes thus: *The Government of Christ, as eternal, and according to what the Angel says in St.* Luke (*p*), *not to have an end, only extends so far, as there can be a Government over the House of* Jacob, *and as this present Frame of things shall endure. Now this shall endure as long as the World, and as long as the last Enemy of Christ, Death, shall remain unsubdu'd. Upon which account, the Son is so to be honour'd as the Father* (*q*). *Crellius* had an eye to a Passage in the former Epistle to the *Corinthians*, where (*r*) St. *Paul* says, that the Son, after he has overcome the last Enemy, *Death*, shall be subject to the Father, and will give up the Kingdom to him. Now in my mind (*s*) *Peter Martyr* has very well reconciled this Place, with those that ascribe an absolute Eternity to the Kingdom of Christ. *To reign, or govern, is sometimes taken for excelling others, having the Pre-eminence, or the highest Place over others. Now in this sense Christ will always reign. But if we say, that to reign is the same as to exercise the Offices of a King, to fight for, to defend, to conquer, and the like; Christ will not always reign. For when we are perfect and compleat, we shall have no occasion for these Aids of Christ. When he came into the World, he preach'd, he taught, he died for our Salvation; now also he intercedes for us with the Father, he defends us from imminent Dangers, and never intermits his Mediatorial Offices and Actions. But at the end, when he hath made an universal Peace, he will resign these Offices to the Father, because then there will be no further occasion for them. Thus, when a powerful Prince sends his only Son to some Province of his Realm, which is seditious, tumultuary and rebellious, the Son goes with Command and a strong Force; but when he has quieted the Commotions, and subdu'd the Rebels, he returns Conqueror to his Father, triumphs, and delivers up the Province in Peace to his Father, no longer uses the military Command, or the Legions,* &c. Now that Christ, after he has deliver'd the Me-

(*p*) Ch. 1. ver. 33. (*q*) Joh. 5. 23. (*r*) 1 Cor. 15. 28.
(*s*) Communium locorum Class. 2. Cap. 17. §. 14. p. 293.

diatorial

diatorial Kingdom to the Father, ſhall not be depriv'd of his Divine Honour, Dignity, Command and Worſhip; but, together with God the Father, ſhall be adored to all Eternity by all Saints, yea by Angels and Archangels; many *Places of Scripture* (*t*) inform us.

10. Let the Hereticks then no longer defend their ſinking Cauſe from the Example of the Angels, who repreſenting God under the Old Teſtament, were Partakers of Divine Worſhip; ſince, by their Confeſſion, thoſe Examples are nothing to their purpoſe. For from the threefold Difference juſt now mention'd, we can draw three invincible Arguments for the Son's Divinity. From the firſt we argue thus: Whoſoever in Heaven may and ought to be worſhipped by Men on Earth, is God: But Chriſt in Heaven, *&c.* Therefore Chriſt is God. Our Adverſaries grant the Aſſumption, and the Truth of the Propoſition is clear. For whoſoever is ſo worſhip'd, either underſtands it, or he does not; if he underſtands it not, he is worſhip'd in vain; if he underſtands it, he is omniſcient and omnipreſent, and conſequently God. You'll ſay that does not follow, becauſe he may underſtand by Divine Revelation. But, I ſay, this is abſolutely impoſſible. For that Knowledge is above a created Underſtanding, and therefore no Creature can have it either of himſelf, or from another. For the Illuſtration of this Matter, take that moſt noble Part of Divine Worſhip, Divine Invocation, which clearly belongs to Chriſt, as the *Scriptures* (*u*) teſtify. Sure it is impoſſible that a human Soul, illuminated by what degree ſoever of Divine Light, ſhould at the ſame time know and underſtand all the Vows and Prayers, daily put up by ſo many Millions of Men, in ſo many Places ſo widely diſtant, to the Name of Chriſt, in the

(*t*) Rom. 9. 5. Heb. 13. 21. 1 Pet. 4. 11.—5. 11. *compared with* 2 Pet. 3. 18. Apocal. 1, 5, 6.—5. 12, 13.

(*u*) Acts 2. 21.—7. 59.—9. 11, 14.——22. 16. Rom. 10. 13. 1 Cor. 1. 2. 1 Theſſ. 3. 11, 12, 13. 2 Theſſ. 2. 16, 17.

ſame moment. The Mind of Chriſt as Man, and exalted to the right hand of God, is indeed wonderfully great; but yet it is not infinite, ſo as to penetrate all Places, and all Perſons, by whom his Sacred Name is at the ſame time invoked in both the Hemiſpheres, and to perceive alſo the moſt ſecret Thoughts of their Hearts, who call upon him. It is the Eye of God only, who at one Glance beholds and ſurveys the whole Globe of the Earth. Whence the *Socinians*, who make uſe of this laſt ſhift to eſtabliſh the Divine Invocation of Chriſt, tho' only mere Man, whilſt they laugh at the Popiſh Dream, by which they commonly defend the Invocation of Saints, the Glaſs of the Trinity (in which the Bleſſed can ſee in the Eſſence of God, as in a Glaſs, all that is made or done upon Earth; yea, can even know the moſt ſecret Thoughts of our Hearts) render themſelves indeed ridiculous to all prudent Men: For if ſuch an Omniſcience can be communicated to the Soul of Chriſt as Man, by Divine Revelation, no good reaſon can be given why the Souls of the Saints, in the ſame manner, may not be, and are not made Partakers of the ſame in their way. *Novatian*'s Argument then is invincible, and in ſpite of the Hereticks will always continue ſo: (x) *If Chriſt was only Man, how is he preſent every where when invok'd, ſince to be capable of being every where, is not the Nature of Man, but of God.*

11. This Argument preſs'd *Socinus* grievouſly, who from it fearing the Ruin of his Cauſe concerning the meer Humanity of Chriſt, was forced to aſſert confidently, that there was no Divine Precept which obliged any Man to call upon the Name of Jeſus Chriſt in his Prayers. Thus in his third Epiſtle to *Radecius*: *Here in the firſt place he confounds Adoration with Invocation, which ought not to be, ſince the Reaſon of both is different. For tho I don't at all doubt that there is a Precept for adoring Chriſt, and that, tho there was not, that he*

(x) P. 737.

certainly

certainly ought to be ador'd, yet I can't think the ſame of invoking him, ſince Invocation is taken for the imploring his Aid, and the Direction of our Prayers. For here I am of Opinion, that we may indeed well do it, that is, may juſtly direct our Prayers to Chriſt himſelf, but yet that there is nothing to oblige us to it. And in another Place (*y*): *We may invoke the Lord Chriſt, but we are under no Obligation to do it.* He is yet more boldly blaſphemous, where he ſays (*z*), *But if any one has ſuch a degree of Faith, as that he dares always apply himſelf directly to God, he has no occaſion to invoke Chriſt.* Thus he writes: 1. Now if *Radecius* confounds Adoration and Invocation, *Socinus* certainly diſtinguiſhes them too ſubtilely. For all Men own that Invocation is that, in which the Worſhip, or Adoration truly Divine, does eſpecially conſiſt, and therefore that it is frequently taken for the whole of Divine Worſhip in Holy Scripture. But indeed what Divine Worſhip he grants to Chriſt, who denies him Invocation, I can't imagine. 2. That Saying of his, *We may worſhip Chriſt, but we are not oblig'd to it*, ſeems incomprehenſible. For I ask, is there any Precept for invoking Chriſt in Scripture, or not? If there is, then we ought, we are obliged to invoke him. But if there is no ſuch Precept in Holy Writ, certainly we can't do it without Sin; unleſs indeed Divine Invocation (the chief Part of the Divine Worſhip) be entirely left at our Diſpoſal. You'll ſay, tho we are not commanded to invoke Chriſt, yet there are broad Hints in Scripture, which plainly ſuggeſt to us, that he is a very proper Object of Divine Invocation, and therefore may juſtly be invoked by us. What are theſe? You'll tell me perhaps, it is plain from Scripture, that Chriſt is very well inclined towards us, that he thoroughly knows all the Neceſſities of our Souls and Bodies, and is a moſt curious Inſpector of all the Secrets of our Hearts, ſo as to know how

(*y*) Reſponſio ad Fr. David.
(*z*) Diſputatio cum Frankenio, p. 4.

all

all who call upon him, are affected *to him* (*a*). Lastly, that he is Almighty, can free us from all impending Evils, be they never so great, and can put us in possession of all the good things *we want* (*b*). I answer: These things are indeed requisite to make a proper Object of Divine Invocation. But, 1. These Attributes argue the Divine Nature of him, who has them, and cannot belong to mere Man, or any created Nature. Therefore the *Socinian* Hypothesis sinks, namely, that Christ is mere Man, or granting this, that he is a fit Object of Invocation truly Divine. 2. Our Argument is still good. For I ask, Whether these Perfections of Christ, celebrated in Scripture, by which he is made a proper Object of Divine Invocation, be such, as that from them Christ has a right to that Worship? If you say they are, then it will necessarily follow, that we not only may, but ought to invoke Christ; for certainly we ought to give every one his due, especially Christ: But if you deny that they are, it will follow that Christ can't lawfully be invoked by us. For we can't, without Sin, give any one Divine Worship (especially Invocation) who has no right to it. So inconsistent is that; *We may invoke the Lord Christ, but we are not oblig'd to it. Nomojevius*, otherwise a great Admirer of *Socinus*, saw this, and makes a Note, very well worth our observing, upon his *Words* just now cited (*c*): *I have diligently read your Answer to the Arguments of* Francis David, *where you assert the Invocation of the Lord Christ, and the Honour due to his Sacred Name, and defend it against his Calumnies. But in my Thoughts you have not only obscur'd your excellent Opinion by a few Words, but also render'd it dubious, and confirm'd your Adversaries in their Error. Do you desire to know what has done all this Mischief? I'll tell you in short. Those Words which you often add* [We may invoke Christ, but we are under no Tie or Obligation

(*a*) Apocal. 2. 23. (*b*) Phil. 3. 21.
(*c*) Ep. 1. *to* Socinus, An. Dom. 1587.

to do it] *threaten your Cause with Ruin. I can't perceive how these things can be reconcil'd,* We are not oblig'd, and yet we may. *As if in the Affair of our Salvation, it was free for us to do, or omit any thing, as we saw it more or less necessary.*

12. Lastly, It is plain from Holy Writ, that we are oblig'd to give the Worship of divine Invocation to the Lord Christ. It is manifest even from this, that in Scripture, all Christians, by virtue of their Religion, are suppos'd to invoke Christ. For this Reason they are describ'd by these Words: *Those that call upon the name of Jesus* (*d*). Besides, by divine Precept we are oblig'd to give the same Worship and Honour to the Son, as we give to *the Father* (*e*). But no one will deny that Invocation is due to the Father. Lastly, the Invocation of Jesus Christ is commanded us in the Gospel, as a Condition absolutely necessary to the obtaining Salvation: *Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved* (*f*). Here by the Word *Lord*, the Context plainly shews that Christ is meant. For, (1.) the Lord, concerning the invoking whom, he speaks, is evidently the same, who is propos'd by him as the Object of (*g*) *Christian Faith*, that is, the Lord Jesus. (2.) The Apostle teaches, that the same Lord is to be call'd upon by all under Peril of Salvation, in whom the *Jews* did not believe, and of whom they might say that they had *not heard* (*h*), which every Man may see can only be understood of our Saviour. Now it is clear as any thing can be from the Places cited, that the Invocation of this Lord, is not only commanded, but also universally requir'd as an absolutely necessary condition of obtaining Salvation. It is almost as clear, that [*to call upon the name of the Lord*] in this Place, is the same as to implore the Lord's aid, or to direct our Prayers to him, or at least, comprehends that under it. For invoking the

(*d*) Acts 9. 14. 1 Cor. 1. 2. (*e*) John 5. 23.
(*f*) Rom. 10. 13. (*g*) V. 9, 10, 11, 12. (*h*) V. 14.

Name

Name of God, has certainly two Senſes in Holy Scripture. (1.) It is in general taken for the whole *Worſhip of God* (*i*). This Signification ſeems to have had this Original, (as *Crellius* well (*k*) obſerves) that Invocation was more frequent than the other Parts of Religion, and upon that account more excellent than the reſt, ſince Neceſſity itſelf uſually forces us to call upon him, and implore his aid, whom we eſteem and worſhip as our God; inſomuch, that among Men, he that does not invoke any one, is never thought to take him for his God. (2.) In a ſtricter Senſe, it is taken for Prayer to God; which Word alſo is ſometimes uſed in a more large, and ſometimes in a more confin'd Senſe. In a more large Senſe, when it comprehends Thankſgiving, as it (*l*) frequently doth; and that for this Reaſon, becauſe they are commonly join'd one with the other. In a ſtricter, or more confin'd and proper Senſe, when it is taken for the deſiring ſome Good, or imploring the divine Aſſiſtance. The former Senſe of the Word ſeems to me moſt natural in this Place; but chuſe whether you pleaſe, our Argument from the Place is valid. But, O Bleſſed Jeſus, to what times haſt thou reſerv'd us, which can ſuffer ſuch horrid Blaſphemy againſt thy Holy Name! Who can hear theſe things without weeping; namely, That no one is oblig'd to pray to thee for thy divine Grace and Aſſiſtance; eſpecially from thoſe, who pretend themſelves Worſhippers of thy Majeſty?

13. Into the ſame depth of Madneſs, driven by the ſame Neceſſity, (*m*) *Volkelius* fell after *Socinus*, and *Schlichtingius*: Yea, *Crellius* himſelf, who talks much every where of the divine Worſhip of Jeſus Chriſt, yet in ſome Places either runs into the Opinion of *Socinus*, or is not far from it. Thus he ſpeaks of thoſe

(*i*) Gen. 12. 8. & 13. 4. & 21. 37. Pſal. 14. 4. & 53. 5. Iſaiah 41. 22. (*k*) P. 380.

(*l*) Luke 18. 10, 11. Acts 3. 1. & 16. 13. Phil. 1. 3, 4.

(*m*) Volkelius de Vera Relig. Lib. 4. Cap. 11. de Invocatione Chriſti ad Meiſner. *p.* 206, & 207.

who

who in their Prayers are defective, are that way in the *Extremes*: He especially notes those (*n*) *who will not direct Prayers to him, and who don't direct them, when there is occasion, to him, to whom they not only might, but for some certain Reasons ought to do it*; adding by way of Example, *As, if any one will not invoke Christ, when others of the Faithful direct their Prayers to him, or Edification otherwise requires it, or the Spirit itself suggests and dictates it to some one.* Observe what a String of Limitations! The Heretick indeed confesses that we may direct our Prayers to Christ, but are not absolutely oblig'd to it, except in certain Cases; as when others do it, lest we should make an unnecessary Separation; or when Edification requires it, that is, when there is Danger, that, if we refuse to invoke him, weak Brethren should suspect, and not without Cause indeed, that we deny divine Worship to Christ; or lastly, when the Spirit dictates it, that is, when we have a fancy to do it, or as oft as we have a mind. But why, I beseech you, must a Christian expect the Dictate of the Spirit before he presumes to direct his Prayers to Christ? There is great danger, forsooth, that he should pray to no purpose, pour himself forth into the empty Air; because it is very uncertain, when the Man Christ is sensible of our Devotions, or when he may be acquainted with the Prayers directed to him, by divine Revelation: and therefore in this most dubious Case, we must have Information from the Holy Spirit. Good God! how deep a Mystery of Iniquity is *Socinianism!*

14. I've been the larger upon this Difference, because I thought it wou'd be of use to the Reader, who is unacquainted with the Tricks and Frauds of the Hereticks, with whom we are engag'd. I come now to the second difference observ'd by *Crellius*, and from this I shall draw another Argument for the Son's Divinity. Whosoever is to be worship'd immediate-

(*n*) Pag. 398.

ly,

ly, or in himſelf with divine Honour, and therefore is alſo worthy of ſuch Worſhip, muſt be true God, God by Nature: But Chriſt is to be worſhip'd immediately, or in himſelf, with divine Honour, *&c.* as the Scripture expreſly affirms, and the Adverſaries themſelves confeſs. Therefore Chriſt is true God, God by Nature. The Propoſition here is very eaſy to be prov'd. No one can be worthy of divine Worſhip, who has not a divine, that is, an infinite Dignity and Excellence; (for that divine Excellence, is the only Foundation of truly divine Worſhip) but divine and infinite Dignity and Excellence only belong to God, can't fall to the ſhare of any Creature (for finite is not capable of infinite) therefore, *&c.* How unanſwerable this Argument is, appears evidently from the Diſpute between *Fauſtus Socinus*, and *Chriſtianus Frankenius*, concerning the Honour of Chriſt, where you find the unfortunate Heretick ſtrangely preſs'd and reduc'd to his laſt Shifts by his Adverſary with almoſt this very Syllogiſm. This *Frankenius* was one of *Socinus*'s Diſciples, who aſſerted, as well as he, that Chriſt was mere Man, but extended the Tenet further than his Maſter would have had him; arguing from it, by neceſſary Conſequence, that our Saviour was not to be worſhip'd by Religious or Divine Worſhip. He and *Socinus* had a diſpute about it in the Hall of *Chriſtopher Paulicovius*, *March* 14. 1584. Frankenius's firſt Argument was this (*o*): *As great as the Diſtance is betwixt the Creator and a Creature, ſo great the Difference ought to be between the Honour given to the Creator and the Creature; but there is the greateſt Difference between the Creator and the Creature, both in Nature and in Dignity: Therefore there ought alſo to be the greateſt Difference between the Honour of God and the Creature. But the Honour chiefly owing to God is religious Adoration; therefore it is not to be given to a Crea-*

(*o*) De Adoratione Chriſti, diſp. cum Frankenio, *p.* 4.

ture;

ture; therefore not to Christ, whom you own to be a mere Creature. What says *Socinus* to this Argument? He answers thus: *Tho' there be the greatest Difference between God and a Creature, there is no Necessity that there should be such a Difference between the Honour of God and a Creature. For God can communicate his Honour to whom he pleases, especially to Christ, who is worthy such Honour, and is not commanded to be ador'd in Scripture without the most weighty Reasons.* A ridiculous Answer indeed, and a mere begging the Question! For the Question between *Socinus* and his Adversary was this: Whether Christ, if a mere Creature, cou'd be honour'd with divine Worship? *Frankenius* proves, that he could not, because the distance between God and a Creature, and consequently between the Honour due to one and the other, must be infinite. Besides, God can't allow divine Worship to any to whom he does not also give the divine Nature and Excellence, of which no Creature is capable: For that would be repugnant to both the divine Wisdom and Truth; to the divine Wisdom, because thus God would confer a Title without reality and foundation; and therefore to the divine Truth, because then he would oblige his Creature to a lye, *i. e.* would command him to ascribe divine Dignity and Excellence to him, (for herein properly consists the truly divine Adoration) in whom such Excellence neither was, nor cou'd be. Lastly, How a mere Creature could be worthy divine Worship, or what those weighty Causes are, for which Christ, tho' mere Man, is commanded to be ador'd in Holy Scripture, no *Socinian* will ever be able to explain. Therefore *Socinus* had nothing else to reply to *Frankenius*, after he had prov'd by many Testimonies, that Divine Worship cou'd not be communicated to any Creature, but this (*p*), *I can answer all those Testimonies.* To this *Frankenius* rejoins: (*q*) *And I can give a probable Answer to all your*

(*p*) Pag. 7. (*q*) Pag. 8.

Places

Places which urge the Adoration of Christ. At length *Socinus*, overcome by the Arguments, but not willing to yield, says: *I'm as sure of the Truth of my Opinion, as I am that I have this Hat in my Hands.* To which *Frankenius* by way of ridicule answers (*r*): *That Assurance of yours can't be a Rule of Faith to me and others. For there is another will tell you, that he is very fully perswaded from Holy Scripture of the Truth of the contrary Opinion.* Thus it is utterly impossible from the *Socinian* Hypothesis, to defend the divine Worship of Jesus Christ.

15. I come now to the third and last Difference, from which I argue thus: Whosoever is to be honour'd with divine Worship, as well as God the Father, for ever, is by Nature God as well as the Father: But Christ is to be honour'd with divine Worship for ever, as well as the Father; therefore Christ is God by Nature, as well as the Father. The minor of this Argument we have prov'd before, (1.) From very plain Testimonies of Holy Scripture, when we spoke concerning this third Difference. The Truth of the Proposition is clear from those places of Scripture (which are very many) where the true God is distinguish'd from the Creatures, as being he, to whom alone divine Honour and Glory is due for *ever and ever* (*s*). (2.) From this undeniable Reason, that the Foundation of eternal Worship must be eternal; but there can be no other eternal Foundation than this, that he who is thus to be worship'd, is by Nature God; therefore Christ, who is thus to be worship'd, is God. The Hereticks make the mediatorial Office of Christ the Foundation of the divine Worship due to him. Now if this was true, it would necessarily follow, that the divine Worship of Jesus our Lord, should then

(*r*) Pag. 9.

(*s*) Matt. 6. 13. Rom. 1. 25. & 11, 36. & 16. 27. Gal. 1. 5. Eph. 3. 21. Phil. 4. 20. 1 Tim. 1. 17. 2 Tim. 4. 18. Jude 25. *v.*

cease,

ceaſe, when the Scriptures expreſly affirm, that mediatorial Kingdom ſhall ceaſe, namely, after Death the laſt Enemy is conquer'd, *i. e.* after the Reſurrection, and the laſt *Judgment* (*t*); for the Cauſe being taken away, the Effect muſt ceaſe. Thus much for the firſt Objection of the Hereticks. What they have gain'd by it, let the impartial Reader judge.

16. But our Adverſaries have yet another Argument in which they greatly confide. For they ſay that the Scriptures have expreſly decided the Queſtion concerning divine Worſhip due to Chriſt for them; where they teach, both that Royal Authority, or judicial Power, is the Foundation of the divine Worſhip due to Chriſt; and that this Authority or Power was given to him by the Father, as Man. Now theſe two Points are clear from the Collation of St. *John*, Chap. 5. v. 22, 23. [*For the Father judgeth no man, but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all men ſhould honour the Son, as they honour the Father*] with the 27th Verſe of the ſame Chapter. And the Father hath given him Power of exerciſing Judgment becauſe he is the Son of Man. To theſe two Places they add a *third* (*u*), where the Apoſtle expreſly teaches, that God hath given to the Man Chriſt, exalted to the greateſt height after his Death, and upon account of it, *a name above every name, that at the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow*, &c. Now that theſe Places of Scripture, which fill every Page of their Writings, (and which they repeat till they are hoarſe) are nothing to their purpoſe, will plainly appear after an accurate Diſquiſition concerning the true meaning of them.

17. (1.) As for the 27th Verſe of the 5th Chapter of St. *John* (the Interpretation whereof depends upon the 22d and 23d Verſes of the ſame Chapter) the Opinions of learned Men have been various concerning the Senſe of it. 1. *Chryſoſtom* diſapproves the receiv'd Punctation of the Words, and thinks the

(*t*) 1 Cor. 15. 24, &c. (*u*) Phil. 2. 6, &c.

Senſe (admitting that Punctation) inconſiſtent; for Chriſt did not therefore receive the Power of judging, becauſe he was Man; if that had been the Reaſon, the ſame Power muſt have been given to all Men. He therefore bids us diſtinguiſh or point the Reading thus: *And he hath given him power alſo to exerciſe judgment*; there make a Semicolon, and then proceed: *Wonder not at this, becauſe he is the Son of Man; for the hour cometh*, &c. So then this is the Senſe: *What I have ſaid of the Power of giving eternal Life, and of Judging, don't you think incredible, becauſe you ſee I am a Man; for I am alſo the Son of God, as ſhall be evident to you hereafter by the Reſurrection, which I will accompliſh.* This Punctation of *Chryſoſtom*'s has been approv'd by *Cyril* and *Theophylact* among the Antients, and by a very learned Modern, *F. Junius*. Nor indeed is it lightly to be rejected; for the *Syriac* Interpreter (of great Authority, and with good Reaſon) has diſtinguiſh'd the Members of this Sentence after the ſame manner, and render'd it thus: *And he hath given him the Power of exerciſing Judgment. Wonder not at it now, becauſe he is the Son of Man.*

18. (2.) Others not changing the Punctation, think our Saviour had an eye in theſe Words to that place of (*x*) *Daniel*, where he propheſies that Power and Government ſhould be given to the Son of Man from the Antient of Days; as if it had been ſaid, *That becauſe he is the Son of Man foretold by* Daniel, *therefore Dominion, and an everlaſting Kingdom over the* Gentiles *ſhould be given him.* So *Camero* has interpreted it, and after him *Grotius*. But the want of the diſtinctive Article, or the Article by way of eminence (as *Eraſmus* obſerves) is repugnant to this Expoſition. It is written ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, not ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς, &c. Now thus it ought to have been written, if deſign'd to point out a Perſon emphatically call'd the Son of Man.

19. The generality of Divines expound this Place concerning the Incarnation and Exinanition of the Son,

(*x*) Chap. 7. v. 13, 14.

thus:

thus: The Father hath therefore given Chriſt the judiciary Power, becauſe he vouchſafed to be made the Son of Man, that is, Man, for the Salvation of Men; and tho' God took upon him Humanity, that he might ſave Mankind, by expoſing it to Death. Wherefore he merited by this ſo great an Exinanition, the being made Man, and dying for Men, this advancement to the judiciary Power, that ſo he ſhould be the Judge as well as the Saviour of all Men. According to this Expoſition (a very probable one) Chriſt deſcribes his own Humiliation ſpoken of, *Phil.* 2. 7. There the Apoſtle exhorts the Faithful to Humbleneſs of Mind, from Chriſt's Example, who, tho' in the Form of God, *i. e.* God, and therefore, in reſpect of his Nature, equal to God the Father, yet did not take upon him that Equality, did not carry himſelf as God, did not make a ſhew of it, being far from Pomp and Oſtentation; but freely let himſelf down, humbled himſelf, taking upon him the form of a Servant, and being made Man, *&c.* therefore his Father gave him a Name above every Name, *&c.* exactly as in the Paſſage of St. *John* it is ſaid, *That therefore the power of judging was given to the Son, becauſe he was the Son of Man.*

20. Laſty, *Auſtin* and *Bede* interpret the Place thus; That the Father had transferr'd the Power of judging the quick and the dead upon the Son, becauſe he was the Son of Man; that is, as he was a Perſon proper and ſuitable to the Office. This Interpretation the learned *Maldonate* (*y*) boldly affirms to be true; who alſo upon the 22d Verſe of the ſame Chapter gives us the ſame Expoſition more at large (*z*): *Now the Father is ſaid to judge no Man, not that he doth not judge in deed; for whatſoever one Perſon doth* extra ſeipſam, *as the Divines define, all the Perſons do at the ſame time; but becauſe he doth not judge in the Perſon of a Judge viſible to thoſe whom he judges, doth not talk with them, paſs a verbal Sentence upon them; in a word, doth not judge in an external way, and judicial form, he is ſaid to judge no one. For*

(*y*) In locum. (*z*) In locum.

the Son alone judgeth in this Senſe, becauſe he alone is Man, ſuch as he ſhou'd be who judges me (a). Therefore it is given as a Reaſon why the Father hath given all judgment to the Son, becauſe he is the Son of Man. You ſee how many ways this Place may be expounded. Now take which of the Expoſitions you pleaſe, it will be of no Service to the Hereticks. To confeſs the Truth, there is a little too much obſcurity and ambiguity, in the Text, to make it the Foundation of any ſound reaſoning.

21. As for the Place cited out of the Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, what the Hereticks preſume, is there affirm'd, namely, That the Father gave Chriſt, as mere Man, a Divine Empire over Men, after his Death, is falſe. The very Words of the Place teach the contrary, that is, that he who took upon him the Form of a Servant, was made Man, before that, was in the Form of God, and conſequently equal to God (*b*); and that he therefore obtain'd the greateſt Glory in the Heavens, and a Name above every Name, becauſe he condeſcended to be made Man for the Salvation of Men, and ſhew'd himſelf obedient to the Father, even to the Death of the Croſs. The Truth and Certainty of this Anſwer depends upon our Interpretation of the Words [*Being in the Form of God, and taking upon him the Form of a Servant.*] How true and natural it is, every one will ſee, who will conſider the Words of St. *Paul* with Attention and Impartiality. For the Apoſtle plainly teaches two things in this

(*a*) Irenæus, Lib. 3. Cap. 9.

(*b*) *Dr.* Clarke *has labour'd this Point without any notice of this accurate Expoſition, and brought in our Author, as of his Mind in interpreting the greateſt Difficulty of the Text. He makes* ἴσα θεῷ, *or* εἶναι ἰσόθεον, *moſt properly to ſignify*, To be honour'd as God; *and ſays our Lord willingly condeſcended to humble himſelf firſt into the Form of a Servant, and then was exalted to be* ἴσα θεῷ, honour'd as Lord of all things. *If this be the true Interpretation, how ſhall we explain thoſe Texts of Scripture, and thoſe Paſſages of Antiquity, which aſſert his Glory and Honour with the Father to be the ſame before he came down from Heaven, as after? What a wonderful Condeſcenſion was it in him, not to covet to be honour'd as God, and what an incomprehenſible thing that he ſhould think of it at all, who was not God?*

Place:

Place: 1. That our Saviour was, and subsisted in the Form of God, before he took upon him the Form of a Servant. Nothing is clearer. For here the Apostle observes upon, and proposes the Example of our Saviour's wonderful Condescension, who, tho in the Form of God, empty'd, or degraded himself in taking upon him the Form of a Servant. Now all Condescension supposes a more exalted State before it, from which a Person descends into a lower. 2. That Christ then took upon him the Form of a Servant, when he was made Man. This is evident from the Words of the Apostle: *He empty'd himself, taking upon him the Form of a Servant, being made in the Likeness of Men.* In this the old *Latin* Interpreter agrees with the *Greek.* Here is a continu'd Exposition, in which the latter Member of the Sentence immediately succeeds the former, and explains it without any Conjunction copulative. If you ask how Christ empty'd or degraded himself, the Apostle tells you, by taking upon him the Form of a Servant. If again you ask how Christ took upon him the Form of a Servant, the Answer immediately follows, by being made in the Likeness of Men, made Man, in all things, Sin only excepted, like unto us. Now from what has been said, it is clear that our Saviour subsisted, and that in the Form of God, before he took upon him human Nature, and therein the Form of a Servant. To make this still more evident, two things are especially to be observed. 1. That the Form of a Servant doth not here signify the servile Condition of Man, as it is opposed to the State and Condition of a free Man, one that is his own Master, as the Hereticks contend, and some Catholicks have impudently granted. For here the Form of a Servant is manifestly oppos'd to the Form of God. Now all Creatures, compared to God, have the Form of Servants, and stand oblig'd to obey God. Hence the Apostle, after he had said that our Saviour took upon him the Form of a Servant, being made in the likeness of Men, quickly adds, being made obedient, namely to God the Father. This the

Apoſtle alſo ſignifies in another Place (*c*), where, after having ſaid that God the Father, in the Fulneſs of Time, ſent forth his Son made of a Woman, he immediately adds, *made under the Law:* Our Saviour therefore then took upon him the Form of a Servant, when he took upon him the created, that is, the human Nature, and in that Nature was made obedient to God. 2. The Apoſtle's elegant Gradation, in deſcribing the Exinanition of Chriſt, is to be obſerved: This by the Catholick Interpretation is preſerved entire; but by the Heretical Comment is obſcur'd, yea wholly deſtroy'd. *Chriſt*, ſays the Apoſtle, *empty'd himſelf, taking upon him the Form of a Servant.* This might have been ſaid of him, if he had taken upon him the Nature of Angels; for Angels themſelves are the Miniſters and Servants of God. Therefore he ſubjoins, *Being made in the likeneſs of Men, and therefore a little lower than Angels* (*d*). It follows, *And being found in faſhion as a Man, he humbled himſelf, being made obedient*, &c. He not only, tho God, took upon him human Nature, but alſo greatly humbled himſelf in it, being made in all things obedient to the Father, even to Death, and that the Death of the Croſs, a painful, infamous and ignominious Death. But that the Words, in which the Apoſtle deſcribes the State, in which our Saviour was before his Exinanition, may be better underſtood, we muſt repeat, what we before obſerved, that *the Form of God*, and *Form of a Servant*, or *Similitude of Men*, are oppos'd to one another. As therefore Chriſt was ſo made in the Similitude of Men, as to be a true Man; in like manner alſo he was ſo in the Form of God, as to be very God. Beſides, from this Oppoſition, of *the Form of God*, and *the Form of a Servant*, we may ſtrongly conclude againſt the *Arians*, that the Nature of Chriſt, in which he ſubſiſted as the Son of God, before his Incarnation, was not a created Nature. The Son of God then only took upon him the Form of a Servant, when he took upon him a created Nature, being made in the like-

(*c*) Gal. 4. 4. (*d*) Heb. 2. 9. *compar'd with* ver. 16.

neſs

ness of Man; he was never before in the Form of a Servant, but subsisted in the Form of God. But according to the *Arians*, who take the Son of God for a Creature, that Son of God was always, even before his Incarnation, in the Form of a Servant. For every Creature, even the most excellent, as I observed just now, compared to God, is in the Form of a Servant, and is obliged to serve and obey God. Hence it is also plain, that the Son of God, according to his more excellent Nature, in which he subsisted before the Incarnation, was equal to God his Father; as is manifestly taught by the Apostle in the following Words. Consult also what we have cited from the Primitive Fathers, *Hermas*, *Clemens Romanus*, and *Justin Martyr*, for the Illustration of *this Place* (*e*). From all these things it is clear, that the *Socinians* have appeal'd to this Passage of the Apostle to no purpose, nay to the Ruin of their own Cause.

22. But it may here be ask'd, how it can be understood from our Hypothesis, by which the Son is God of God, and Partaker of the same Glory with God the Father, that the Divine Government was deliver'd up to him after his Passion and Resurrection. I answer, it may be understood three Ways: 1. After this manner, That the Son of God, having accomplish'd the Work of Man's Redemption upon Earth, acquir'd to himself a Divine Government over Men by a new and real Title, and consequently Divine Honour to be paid him by Men, namely, by the Title of Saviour or Redeemer. Our Learned *Jackson* (*f*) very well explains this Matter in his Commentaries upon the Apostles Creed, thus: *God the Father, tho he had never created this visible World, had been no less glorious than he now is. For the Creation indeed added much to the things created, yea, gave them their All, but nothing to God, who is infinite in Essence. Nevertheless, if God had created nothing, there had been no Foundation for the Attribute of*

(*e*) Defence of the *Nicene* Creed, Sect. 2. Ch. 2. §. 2. & Ch. 3. §. 4. & Ch. 4. §. 7.

(*f*) *Upon the Creed of the Apostles*, Lib. 11. Ch. 3.

Creator, nay, it had not been a true and real Attribute of God. After the same manner, suppose the Son of God never to have descended, in order to the taking our Nature upon him, he had remain'd no less glorious in Nature and Person than he now is, yet he had not been glorify'd by, or for the Title or Attribute of Incarnation. Or suppose the same Son of God had never humbled himself to Death, having taken upon him the Form of a Servant, (in this the Learned Man is mistaken, that he refers the Form of a Servant to the lowest degree of our Lord's Exinanition) *he had certainly remain'd no less glorious in his Nature, his Person, and his Attribute of Incarnation, than he now is; but yet he would not have had those magnificent Titles, by which he is call'd OUR LORD, OUR REDEEMER, and the Fountain of our Grace and Salvation. All these Attributes are real, and therefore suppose a real Foundation, namely, that Christ humbled himself to Death, and that the Death of the Cross. Nor are these only real Attributes, but also more honourable (both in respect to God the Father, who of his good pleasure gave his only-begotten Son for us, and in respect to the Son of God, who by his Exinanition was pleas'd to pay the Price of our Redemption) than the Attribute of Creation. Therefore the Son of God also, not the Son of* David *only, was exalted after Death by a new and real Title, namely, the Title of REDEMPTION and SALVATION.*

23. This, no doubt, was what the Apostle had a mind to signify to us in the (*g*) *Place* just now cited, where he teaches that Christ (who, as the Son of God, before he was made Man, was in the Form of God, and equal to God the Father) was so exalted after his Death by God the Father, that now all Men are of right oblig'd to confess he is *their Lord*; namely, by a new Title, as he has redeem'd them with his own precious Blood, that they should no longer be in their own power, but his Servants, as *bought with a Price* (*h*). Now the Merit of this Title is more than once greatly extolled in the *Apocalypse*. Thus the four living Crea-

(*g*) Ver. 11. (*h*) *Compare* 1 Cor. 6. *Verse the last, and* 7. *ver.* 22, 23. *with* 1 Pet. 1. 19. *but especially* Rom. 14. 8, 9.

tures,

tures, and the twenty-four Elders, ſing this new Song to the Lamb of God (*i*): *Thou art worthy to receive the Book, and to open the Seals thereof, for thou waſt ſlain, and haſt redeem'd us to God by thy Blood, out of every Tribe, and Language, and People, and Nation.* Then ſing the *Choir* of Angels: (*k*) *Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wiſdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Bleſſing.* This Divine Honour is given to the Son of God in right of Redemption, as that is given to God the Father in right of Creation, which we find in *another Place* (*l*): *Worthy art thou, O Lord, to receive Glory, and Honour, and Power; for thou haſt made all things, and for thy pleaſure they are and were created.* God the Father is glorify'd for the Work of the Creation, not as tho the Son, (*m*) *by whom* he made all things, was not alſo to be glorify'd upon the ſame account; but as the Father is the Fountain of the Deity, from whom the Son had both his Nature, and all his Divine Operations. God the Son is glorify'd for the Work of Man's Redemption, not as tho God the Father was not alſo to be glorify'd for the ſame Cauſe (for he, of his infinite Compaſſion to Mankind, ſent (*n*) *his Son* into the World for our Salvation) but becauſe the Son alone took upon him Human Nature, and in that Nature was made obedient even to Death, therefore the Work of Man's Redemption is, as it were, appropriated to the Son.

24. Now from this, that the Son by his Humiliation has a juſt Title, and a moſt equitable Right to a divine Authority over, and Honour from Men (to obſerve this by the way) we have this ſtrong Argument for his Divinity: Whoſoever has a juſt Title to divine Authority over Men, and divine Honours from them, muſt be God; but the Son has a juſt Title to divine Authority over Men, *&c.* Therefore the Son muſt be God. The Hereticks acknowledge the Minor, nor need we thank them for it, ſince it is very clearly prov'd from the Scriptures juſt now cited, which in-

(*i*) Ch. 5. ver. 9. (*k*) Ver. 12. (*l*) Ch. 4. verſe the laſt.
(*m*) John 1. 3. Col. 1. 16. (*n*) John 3. 16.

form

form us, that divine Authority, and divine Honours, are as well due to God the Son, as Redeemer, as to God the Father as Creator. For the Major, no ſober Man can doubt of it. For it is certain, and confeſs'd by our Adverſaries, that no Creature can ſtrictly merit that eternal Glory and Happineſs, which holy Men ſhall partake of in the other World. How much more, abſurd ſhou'd I ſay, or rather ſhocking, is it to ſay, that a mere Man can merit divine Honours, and even acquire to himſelf the Throne of God? Suppoſe, as *Socinus* doth, that Chriſt is only mere Man, how can you find ſuch Merit in his Obedience? When he was Man, he appear'd as a common Man, he underwent Death, and that, as God would have it, the Death of the Croſs. Now what did Chriſt, more than *Peter* the Apoſtle of Chriſt? (if we may give Credit to Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.) Could he then, as Man merit the Crown of the Saints by all his Sufferings? No. What the (*o*) *Apoſtle* ſays, is certainly true of all the Sufferings of Men; *I reckon the Sufferings of this preſent time, not worthy to be compar'd to the Glory which ſhall be reveal'd to us.* How much leſs, if he was only meer Man, could Chriſt by his Paſſion merit divine Honours? On the other hand, if, as the Apoſtle doth, you conceive the Son of God to have exiſted firſt in the form of God, and conſequently in reſpect of his Nature to have been equal to God; then to have taken upon him the form of a Servant, and to have been made Man; laſtly, in this Nature to have obey'd God the Father to Death, even the Death of the Croſs; we ſhall immediately perceive his infinite Condeſcenſion, and of conſequence, his infinite Merit. This by way of Digreſſion. This then is the firſt and chief reaſon why, as it were, a new divine Authority is in Scripture given to the Son of God, partaker of the divine Nature and Honour with God the Father, after his Death; namely, becauſe after he had accompliſh'd the Work of our Redemption, he acquired this Authority by a new *Title* (*p*).

(*o*) Rom. 8. 18. (*p*) *See Def. N. Cr.* Sect. 2. cap. 3. §. 15.

25. (2.) It may alſo be underſtood of that new and illuſtrious Manifeſtation of the Glory and divine Majeſty of God the Son, made all the World over after his Reſurrection and Aſcenſion into Heaven. Whilſt the Son was upon Earth, he was found in faſhion as a Man, a mere Man, made no appearance of any thing more, except that in his Miracles ſome glimpſe of the divine Majeſty ſhew'd themſelves through the Veil of the human Fleſh. But after his Aſcenſion into Heaven, the Glory of the Son was wonderfully reveal'd, by the Holy Spirit pour'd out upon the Apoſtles by him, by the ſtupendous Miracles wrought in his Name, by his Goſpel preach'd every where, the Believers being baptiz'd, not only in the Name of the Father, but alſo of the Son and Holy Spirit. This Manifeſtation of the Son's divine Majeſty was the more illuſtrious, becauſe, not only whilſt he convers'd among Men in human Fleſh, but alſo in the Ages before that, his Divinity was either but obſcurely known, or wholly unknown. *Tertullian* ſpeaks very well of this Matter (*q*): *It pleas'd God ſo to renew the Covenant, as that he ſhould after a new manner be believ'd one through the Son and Holy Spirit; that he ſhould be openly known in his proper Names, who in times paſt was not underſtood to be preach'd in the Son and Spirit.* Well then is that ſaid to be a new divine Authority given to the Son after his Reſurrection, becauſe before that time his divine Majeſty and Authority was ſcarce known unto Men, (tho' as the Word of God, by whom all things were made, he together with the Father exercis'd divine Authority over Men before the Creation.)

26. If I'm not greatly miſtaken, this is what the divine Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* (*r*) means: *God, who in diverſe manners hath in time paſt ſpoken to the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in theſe laſt Days ſpoken to us by his Son, whom he hath made Heir of all things, by whom alſo he made the World: who being the Splendor of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Eſſence, and governing all things by his powerful Word, having purify'd our*

(*q*) Pag. 518. (*r*) Chap. 1. v. 1, *&c.*

Sins

Sins by himself, is sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. In these Words the Holy Writer clearly expresses both a new Manifestation, and a new Title of the Son's divine Authority; a new Manifestation, *ver.* 2. where he shews, that the Son now at length, in these last days, had manifested himself in the Flesh, and after having accomplish'd the Redemption of Mankind in that Flesh, was by the promulg'd Decree of his Father made Heir and Lord of all things; but yet that his Authority did not then take its beginning: since that it is he, by whom God made the World; and (as it follows) with whom God the Father hath from the Creation administer'd and dispos'd all things. Thus *Ignatius* says of the Son of God (*s*): *Who was with the Father before Ages, and appear'd at the end.* So after him *Justin* speaks: *He who was from the beginning, but appear'd of late.* And, *He who always was, but to-day is esteem'd the Son.* And again: *Saying that then he was born to Men, when he was about to be reveal'd.* The divine Author declares his new Title, *ver.* 3. where he teaches that the Son of God, tho' he was the Splendor of his Glory, and the express Image of his Father's Essence, and administred all things by his most powerful Word; yet made an expiation for our Sins, having taken upon him our Flesh, died for us in it, and after he had perfected the Expiation, ascended the Throne of the divine Majesty on high, as having by the most just Title, a right to that Seat. Great is the Emphasis of those Words, *By himself made Expiation,* &c. For by them is signified, that the Son of God, the Splendor of his Father's Glory, &c. did not constitute another Minister of this Expiation, but took our Nature into the Unity of his divine Person, and in that Flesh offer'd himself a Sacrifice for Sins. By the same Emphasis, God, or the Lord, is in another place said to have purchas'd the Church by his *own Blood* (*t*); where the most antient *Alexandrian* Copy, has it in a form yet more emphatical, as tho' we should say, *pur-*

(*s*) P. A. vol. 2. p. 18. (*t*) Acts 20. 28.

chas'd

chas'd it by Blood, and that his own proper Blood. The ſtreſs of our Interpretation lies upon theſe Words, *By whom he made the Worlds*, which we have elſewhere clearly and at (*u*) *large ſhewn*, muſt need be underſtood of the Creation of the World properly ſo call'd. This ſuppos'd, it is clear from this place, that the Son of God was before all Ages with God the Father, and exiſted in the Paternal Nature and Glory; then that the Univerſe was made by Him, and afterwards by his moſt powerful Authority and Command, govern'd and directed; nevertheleſs that the divine Authority of the Son lay hid, as it were, till the laſt times of the Goſpel, and was at length reveal'd, when the Son took upon him human Nature, humbled himſelf to Death for the Salvation of Mankind, and thus, as it were, by a new and juſt Title acquir'd divine Authority over Men.

27. The Oeconomy of the Divine Perſons in the moſt Holy Trinity, is to me indeed wonderful; that Oeconomy, by which every diſtinct Perſon holds Mankind obliged to his Divine Authority, by a diſtinct Title, with which Title the diſtinct Revelation of every Perſon's Authority correſponds. We worſhip the Father under the Title of Creator of the Univerſe, who was alſo known to Men from the Creation of the World: We worſhip the Son under the Title of our Saviour and Redeemer, whoſe Divine Glory and Authority therefore was not revealed, till he had accompliſhed the Affair of Man's Salvation and Redemption upon Earth. Laſtly, we worſhip the Holy Spirit under the Title of *Paraclete*, our Inlightner and Sanctifier, whoſe Divine Majeſty did then appear more plain after his Deſcent upon the Apoſtles and firſt Chriſtians, exceeding illuſtrious by the moſt plentiful Effuſions of all ſorts of Gifts. Then at laſt the Apoſtles, and that by their Lord's Command, baptized the Nations into the full and united Trinity, (as St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks) *i. e. in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.* This is what *Tertullian* intends,

(*u*) *Judgment of the Cath. Church*, Cap. 5. Sect. 8.

when

when giving the reaſon, why Chriſt did not baptize himſelf, he ſays: *Into whom ſhould he baptize? Into Repentance? What buſineſs then had his Forerunner? Into the Remiſſion of Sins, which he gave by a Word? Into himſelf, whom he veil'd with Humility? Into the Holy Spirit, who was not yet deſcended from the Father?* After this Revelation, by which the Divine Nature is known in its diſtinct Perſons, all thoſe, to whom it is made, are in Right bound, and by Divine Precept obliged to pay the ſame Divine Worſhip and Honour to the Son, which they pay to the Father; tho before it was ſufficient for all the Pious among God's People to worſhip and adore One God the Father of all things, without that diſtinct Acknowledgment of Perſons. Hence thoſe Sayings, that under the Goſpel it is required, that *all Men honour the Son, as they honour the Father*; and *he that denieth the Son, hath not the Father* (x).

28. We now come to the third way, or manner, by which the Son of God, God of God the Father before Ages, acquired, as it were, a new Divine Authority. The Son of God, having taken upon him human Nature, and in that humbled himſelf, being obedient to the Father, even to the Death of the Croſs, was truly and properly exalted after his Reſurrection, and advanced to the right hand of the Father. Now whatſoever was added to the human Nature either by his Humiliation or Exaltation, is with good reaſon in Scripture attributed to the Son of God, upon account of the nice and unſpeakable Communion of the Human Nature with the Divine Perſon of the Son of God, as *Origen* expreſſes the hypoſtatical Union. So he who *was in the Form of God, and equal to God, was made obedient to the Death of the Croſs:* He who is the Splendor of the Father's Glory, by whoſe moſt powerful Command and Authority all things are adminiſter'd, made an Expiation for Sins by himſelf: He, who was the Prince of Life, is ſaid to (y) *be kill'd*, and the Lord of Glory to (z) *be crucify'd*. So, on the

(x) John 5. 23. 1 John 2. 23. (y) Acts 3. 15.
(z) 1 Cor. 2, 8.

other

other hand, God [*the Son*] is said to be *receiv'd up into Glory* (*a*), namely, in that Flesh in which he was manifested. To this Head also may be refer'd the Words of our Lord's Prayer, which he put up when he was about *to die* (*b*): *I have glorify'd thee upon Earth, I have finish'd the Work thou gavest me to do; and now, Father, glorify me with the Glory I had with thee before the World was.* He desires that the Glory, which his Divine Nature always had with the Father before the World was made, may now be given to his Human Nature, not only by raising it from the Dead, and exalting it to Heaven; but also by placing it at the right hand of God, where the Divine Nature always was. In vain do the Hereticks endeavour to elude the Force of this Place by interpreting it of the divine Predestination, as their Predecessors did formerly (*c*); for they can't confirm this Interpretation by any suitable Texts of Holy Scripture. What they pretend, that the (*d*) *Apostle* speaks after the same manner, where he says of the Believers, that *Grace was given to them before Ages*, is a very great Mistake. Let us read the entire Passage: *Of him that sav'd us, and call'd us with an holy Calling; not according to our Works, but his own Purpose and Grace given to us in Jesus Christ before Ages.* How great a difference is there between this Place, and that before us. For, 1. The Apostle doth not absolutely say, *according to the Grace given*, but, *according to the Purpose and Grace given.* Now these words are either spoken figuratively, *the Purpose and Grace* being put for *the gracious Purpose* (as (*e*) afterwards, *Life and Incorruptibility* are put for *the incorruptible Life*) or they are to be taken in this plain Sense; *According to the Grace*, which God *purpos'd, or decreed to give us in Christ before Ages.* Again, Christ does not say, *the Glory which thou gavest me before the World was made*, but, *which I had.* No Man can avoid seeing the difference between these. For it may be said, that Grace is then given by God, with regard to the Certainty of his Purpose, by which he

(*a*) 1 Tim. 3. 16. (*b*) John 17. 4, 5. (*c*) Novatian de Trinitate. (*d*) 2 Tim. 1. 9. (*e*) Ver. 10.

de-

decreed that the Faithful ſhould have that Grace in Chriſt, in After-Ages, tho neither that Grace, nor thoſe Perſons, were then in actual being, who ſhould have what was given them. Now the word [*have*] is poſſeſſive, and denotes the preſent Act and Fruition, (as the (*f*) *Biſhop of Ely* has well obſerv'd upon this Place.) Laſtly, it is thus in the Words of Chriſt, *the Glory which I had with thee*, namely, when I exiſted along with thee. Nor is it to be doubted that theſe Words of Chriſt, *The Glory which I had with thee before the World was made*, have the ſame Senſe with the Saying of St. *John* in the beginning of the Goſpel, that *the Word was in the beginning with God, i. e.* the Father. Beſides, we have ſhewn in (*g*) *another* place, how the human Nature of Chriſt, exalted in the Heavens, is partaker of the divine Glory and Honour.

29. Thus much concerning the Adoration of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Argument drawn from it by *Juſtin* and other Fathers to prove his Divinity. From all that has been ſaid, I think it is now very plain, that the Religion of the beſt Men, which made them afraid of giving divine Worſhip to a mere Man, was not (as *Zuicker*, that inſolent Deſpiſer of the Fathers imagin'd) Vain, Puerile, and Superſtitious; but ſupported by the beſt and ſtrongeſt Reaſons, which they, and their Accomplices, the Worſhippers of Man, may much eaſier contemn than refute.

To the only God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, be given Adoration and Bleſſing for ever and ever. Amen.

(*f*) *Againſt the* Racovian *Catechiſm*, Sect. 23.
(*g*) *Def. N. Cr.* Sect. 2. Cap. 3. & 15.

F I N I S.